

THEORETICAL CONCEPTIONS OF CURRICULUM: IMPLICATIONS
FOR JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

A Dissertation
Presented to
the School of Education
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Ann Abramson
August 1991

Locke
1991
AG2
C.2

THEORETICAL CONCEPTIONS OF CURRICULUM: IMPLICATIONS
FOR JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

An abstract of a dissertation by
Ann Abramson
August 1991
Drake University
Advisor: Dr. Paul Joslin

The problem. Despite a growing body of research identifying the positive impact of appropriate educational interventions in the successful rehabilitation of incarcerated juveniles, recidivism rates for juvenile offenders remain high. The costs of this apparent failure of juvenile corrections has led juvenile correctional educators to call for a thorough reexamination of the curricular experience available to juvenile offenders. To date, however, the field remains without a comprehensive analysis. Specifically, juvenile correctional education has not undertaken the theoretical analysis of curriculum within which current methods and programs can be evaluated.

Procedures. Content analysis is employed to determine the theoretical orientation of juvenile correctional curriculum. Articles relevant to juvenile correctional education published in The Journal of Correctional Education are examined for points of correspondence with descriptors of empirical-analytic, hermeneutic, and critical curriculum theory. Frequency is employed to assess the impact of empirical-analytic, hermeneutic, and critical curriculum theory on juvenile correctional education.

Findings. This paper concludes that juvenile correctional education is primarily influenced by the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum. While other theoretical orientations are also present in the descriptions of juvenile correctional education, the fundamental orientation to knowledge, activity, and values are those of an empirical-analytic approach.

Recommendations. Further content analysis of other indigenous forms of communication in the field of juvenile correctional education would be useful in assessing the validity of this study. Further studies might also examine more closely the relationship

between an empirical-analytic theoretical approach to juvenile correctional education and classroom practice, as well as the feasibility and desirability of the goals of juvenile correctional education both in terms of the field's theoretical orientation and the requirements of the society and students it serves.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study	8
Research Questions	8
II. METHODOLOGY	10
Content Analysis	10
Design of the Study	24
III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	32
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	59
The Pilot Study	59
The Sample	62
Data Collection	62
Recorded Data	63
Summary of the Data	71
Reliability of the Data	74
Reliability of the Sample	75
Validity of the Data	77
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION,	
AND RECOMMENDATIONS	82
Summary	82

	Page
Conclusions	84
Discussion	86
Recommendations	95
REFERENCES	99
APPENDIXES	
A. SAMPLING UNITS	113
B. RECORDING FORM	119
C. CODING INSTRUCTIONS	123
D. RECORDING FORM-R	125
E. TABLE A	129

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequency of Correspondences between Recording Units and Context Units in the Samples	70
2. Frequency of Correspondences between Recording Units and Context Units in the Sample and Split-Half Samples . .	77

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

This year, America will again incarcerate her children at a rate that is among the highest in the world. As many as 500,000 children and adolescents aged 10 to 17 will be held in jails or secure detention centers, and another 75,000 will be sentenced to determinate terms in juvenile correctional institutions (Snarr & Wolford, 1985; U.S. Department of Justice, 1984). Accounting for approximately 2% of America's adolescent population, these incarcerated juveniles share the common status of adjudicated delinquents: They have all committed serious offenses against persons or property and as a result are considered sufficiently dangerous to themselves and/or others to warrant rehabilitation in a correctional setting.

Throughout the history of juvenile correctional programs, "valued general education" has been acknowledged "as an essential element of any reform programme" (Angle, 1982, p. 5) and "a major tool of inmate rehabilitation" (Roberts, 1989, p. 148). Today, incarcerated juveniles spend as much as 40% of their waking hours in school, and much is known about their

educational needs: Three of every four adjudicated delinquents have dropped out or been pushed out of public schools prior to incarceration (Perryman, 1988). Despite the fact that at least 85% of these youth are of normal intelligence, most read, write, and spell two to six years below grade level (Besag & Greene, 1981; Broder, Dunivant, Smith, & Sutton, 1981; Mesinger, 1977; Murphy, 1986; Prout, 1981). As many as 42% of all incarcerated youth have special education needs (Cole, Chan, & Lytton, 1989; Morgan, 1979; Rutherford, Nelson, & Wolford, 1985).

Virtually all incarcerated juveniles lack the social skills necessary to function adequately in social and vocational settings (Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe, Schlundy, & McFall, 1978; Patterson, Reid, Jones, & Conger, 1975). They often cannot delay gratification, accept direction, identify problems, or predict potential consequences of behavior(s) (Besag & Greene, 1981; Hazel, Schumaker, Sherman, & Sheldon, 1982). In general, incarcerated youth suffer from the low levels of self-esteem and discipline associated with deviant social responses (Kaplan, 1975; Richey & Miller, 1987). Unsuccessful in school as well as in

society, they have become accustomed to failure (Mercantino, 1980).

A growing body of research supports the positive impact of appropriate educational intervention(s) in altering this pattern of academic and social failure (Freedman et al., 1978; Grande, 1987; Nelson, Rutherford, & Wolford, 1987). Despite the broad range of profound and atypical learning needs of confined students and the well-documented institutional barriers to education in any correctional environment, many students do experience positive gains in academic and social skills during incarceration (Lewis, Schwartz, & Ianacone, 1988; Pasternak, Portillos, & Hoff, 1988). In 1988, G. R. Grissom reported incarcerated youth attending the Glen Mills Schools achieved nearly two months growth in reading and mathematics for each month of instruction. Similar changes have been documented in other corrections classrooms (Murphy, 1986).

However, insofar as juvenile correctional education attempts to extend the impact of such academic and social skill gains beyond the correctional classroom, there is much room for improvement (Elliott, 1980; Romig, 1978). Designed in part "to return the

youthful delinquent to society and the local schools with a greater potential for successful adaptation" (Mercantino, 1980, p. 19), correctional classrooms remain the terminal educational experience for most incarcerated juveniles. At least 90% of the children released from correctional institutions do not return to public schools for an extended period of time; only slightly more than 1% ultimately graduate from high school (Besag & Greene, 1981; Haberman & Quinn, 1986). Moreover, recidivism rates for juvenile offenders remain high: Percentages ranging from 34 to 71 are standard (Harper, 1986). Nationally, the figure is 41%, and even the highly regarded Glen Mills Project acknowledges that 39% of its graduates are reincarcerated before they reach age 18 (Grissom, 1988; U.S. Department of Justice, 1988). Only 3 of every 10 incarcerated juveniles are ultimately successful in extricating themselves from the court system; the other 7 appear frequently in adult courts as heavy drinkers, substance abusers, and/or chronic offenders (Robins, 1966). On the way to adult court, these juveniles commit 40% of all violent crimes in America (Ryan, 1983; Snarr & Wolford, 1985).

As a result of this pattern of recidivism and the increased demand for educational services to incarcerated juveniles, juvenile correctional education is now one of the most rapidly expanding and expensive school systems in America (Sindelar, 1982; Smith, 1983). Each time just one juvenile is reincarcerated it costs approximately 30,000 dollars for one year's room, board, and education, and these costs are expected to rise dramatically in coming years. Rosander (1987) noted that the increasing cost of correctional education has become a serious burden to taxpayers in this era of limited resources. Thus, while there continue to exist strong historical, economic, and moral imperatives for continuing juvenile correctional educational programs, the direction and quality of the effort must be reexamined: Juvenile correctional educators simply cannot afford to incarcerate and educate juvenile offenders again and again with little promise of success. In terms of both educational resources and human potential, the cost is simply too high.

Correctional educators have acknowledged this situation by calling for new approaches to the juvenile correctional education experience. Many juvenile

educators have responded by targeting specific aspects of the juvenile corrections curriculum for revision. Laufenberg (1987) has called for more emphasis on instructional strategies designed to teach positive peer interaction skills. Holder (1988) has championed moral education as a needed addition to the correctional curriculum. Sutton and Whittier (1989) have reviewed programs designed to facilitate successful transitions to community based services and pronounced them inadequate, and Oliver (1990) has stressed the need for improvements in the instructional technology available to incarcerated youth.

While such analyses of discrete components of juvenile correctional education may signify important contributions, they are unlikely to produce the fundamental reexamination of juvenile correctional education that the field's current situation demands (Smith, 1983). As Thom Gehring (1988, p. 168) notes, these examinations of curriculum variables represent only "the sojourner's outlook" on the field because of the author's attempt to move from "what is" to "what should be" without examining current practice(s) in light of past and present ways of thinking about the entire experience (Herman, 1989). They attempt to

analyze juvenile correctional curriculum apart from its context. For many juvenile correctional educators, however, it is precisely this more comprehensive analysis of their field that is required to fulfill "their aspiration to redefine curricula" into an experience consistent with successful rehabilitation (Gehring, 1989, p. 167).

Statement of the Problem

Despite a growing body of research identifying the positive impact of appropriate educational interventions in the successful rehabilitation of incarcerated juveniles, recidivism rates for juvenile offenders remain high. The costs of this apparent failure of juvenile corrections has led juvenile correctional educators to call for a thorough reexamination of the curricular experience available to juvenile offenders. To date, however, the field remains without a comprehensive analysis. Specifically, juvenile correctional education has not undertaken the theoretical analysis of curriculum within which current methods and programs can be evaluated.

Purpose of the Study

Both Michael Apple (1979) and James B. Macdonald (1977) assert that it is the delineation of the theoretical constructs and explicit statements of values inherent in curriculum theory that provide the context within which educational methods and programs can be evaluated. It is the purpose of this research to contribute to this effort by examining current ways of thinking about juvenile correctional education in light of the major theoretical orientations presented in curriculum theory. This is accomplished via analysis of articles relevant to juvenile correctional education published in The Journal of Correctional Education. The methodology employed is that of content analysis. Chapter II of this report describes both content analysis in general and its application to this study in particular. In Chapter III, the context of the analysis is explored in a review of orientations to curriculum theory.

Research Questions

By placing contemporary descriptions of juvenile correctional education methods and programs in the context of curriculum theory, this analysis addresses

the following research questions: Is juvenile correctional education grounded in any particular conception of curriculum? If so, what conception(s) of the knowledge, activity, and values central to curriculum are reflected in this orientation? In Chapter IV, these questions are examined based on the data from the content analysis. In Chapter V, the implications of the research results are discussed and directions for further research are recommended.

Chapter II

METHODOLOGY

Content Analysis

Content analysis affords correctional educators a research technique for examining current practices in relationship to their curricular context. Although the methodology has been defined in a variety of ways (Holsti, 1969), content analysis is generally understood as a systematic and objective process of categorizing data sources for the purpose of tabulation, classification, and/or summarization (Fox, 1969).

Content analysis was first employed during the Eighteenth Century as a simple, descriptive technique for tabulating the frequency of words or phrases in verbal and written communications (Krippendorff, 1980). Since then, the development of the research methodology has roughly paralleled the growth of mass communication and information processing capabilities. Used during the Nineteenth Century primarily for examining the content of newspaper articles, content analysis is now employed in hypothesis testing and computer-enhanced systems analysis across the spectrum of the humanities

and social sciences (Borg & Gall, 1983; Carney, 1972; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1986).

Researchers have identified and classified specific types and applications of content analysis. Janis (1965) and Holsti (1969) place the data to be analyzed in the context of communication and assign three principal applications: (a) Describing the content (what or how) of communication, (b) Identifying the antecedent (why) of communication, and (c) Making inferences about the effects of communication. Others describe applications in various empirical domains (Stone, Dunphy, Smith, & Ogilvie, 1966) and make distinctions based on the types of inferences content analyses may produce (Krippendorff, 1980). Whatever taxonomy is employed, however, writers agree that content analysis is unique among research methodologies in that it is "capable, first, of accepting relatively unstructured symbolic communications as data and, second, of analyzing unobserved phenomena" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 33). To the extent that it thus allows the researcher to make valid inferences from the symbolic data of social practices to their context, content analysis is particularly well suited for educational research (Borg & Gall, 1983).

Content analysis designs enable researchers to make "replicable and valid inferences from data to their context" by applying a specific sequence of steps (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 21). The first step involves what Krippendorff describes as "data making." Because content analysis data is typically derived from symbolic forms of communication (e.g., written language, films, plays, group interactions, drawings, speeches, interviews, etc.), and such sources of data are generally large and unstructured, the researcher's initial task is one of describing both the sources of data and its sources as distinguishable and separate phenomena. To meet the criterion of replicability, these units must appear as permanent products (Krippendorff, 1980).

Content analysis requires the description of data in terms of sampling units, recording units, and context units (Budd & Thorp, 1963; Carney, 1972; Krippendorff, 1980). The researcher begins to analyze content by deciding exactly which sources will be investigated. To minimize bias in the sample, an appropriate sampling technique must be selected. Samples may be obtained either randomly or

systematically and are derived either from the entire sampling possibilities or a segment thereof.

Content analysis is not limited to any one type of sample so that data can be obtained from a variety of data sources, and it is uniquely capable of analyzing large and unstructured sources of data (e.g., newspaper editorials, television interviews, cartoons, novels, plays, poetry, social behaviors, etc.). Whatever sources of data are included in the sample, each unit (i.e., each editorial, each interview, each cartoon, or each behavior) appears independently of other units so that its inclusion or exclusion in the sample does not affect the researcher's choice of other units. Any one sampling unit has no empirical or descriptive significance beyond the stated purpose of the analysis (Gerbner, Holsti, Krippendorff, Paisley, & Stone, 1969).

Whereas content analysis resembles other research methodologies in regard to sampling procedures, it distinguishes itself from other methods in that it does not demand a minimum sample size (Budd & Thorp, 1963). In general, a sample is considered large enough when the inclusion of additional units does not improve the reliability of the of the analysis. Krippendorff

(1980, p. 69) recommends the "split half technique" to determine the adequacy of sample size. This involves dividing the sample into two equal parts. If either part supports the same conclusion as the whole when both are subjected to the same analysis, sample size is deemed adequate. When this condition is not met, the researcher may wish to increase the size of the sample.

In most content analyses, sampling units tend to be rather complex. For example, a newspaper editorial may contain several paragraphs, each expressing one or more statements of opinion. To analyze the content of the editorial, the researcher might find it efficacious to examine each paragraph (or each statement within the paragraph) individually. Such "separately analyzable parts of a sampling unit" are called recording units and "while sampling units tend to have identifiable boundaries, the distinctions among recording units are achieved as the result of a descriptive effort" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 58). Thus, while one television interview has an easily identifiable beginning and end, the statements contained in the interview may be interrelated. It is up to the researcher to describe what he or she means by "a

statement" to the extent that individual statements evolve into recording units that can be analyzed both individually and collectively.

Recording units describe symbolic forms of communication. The content analyst seeks to understand this communication in light of its contextual significance. To accomplish this, the analyst must also unitize the context by establishing context units. Context units describe recording units in terms of the "unobserved states or properties of the source not manifest in the recorded text" (Gerbner et al., 1969, p. 9). They are determined by the researcher based on his or her investigative purpose and serve to classify recording units according to relevant contextual characteristics.

"Context units establish the limits of the contextual information that may enter the description of a recording unit. . . . They may overlap and contain many recording units" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 59). For example, the statements made in a television interview can be placed in the context of favorable or unfavorable, positive or negative, ambiguous or highly opinionated communications. An individual statement might be classified as both negative and highly

opinionated, but each characteristic would be clearly described in the researcher's definition of the context units.

Geller, Kaplan, and Lasswell (1942) emphasize that the size of context units may have an impact on the reliability of content analyses. Their study concluded that where analysis is concerned with the extent of the bias contained in the recording units, larger context units tend to be problematic. In content analyses concerned solely with the direction of the bias, however, the size of the content units has little impact. Thus the researcher must take care in defining context units: They must be broad enough to characterize the data being analyzed (i.e., the recording units) but not so ambiguous as cast doubt on the replicability of the research design.

Content analyses employ a variety of ways of selecting sampling, recording, and context units (Carney, 1972; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980, 1986). Physical units have been employed in a number of content analyses as investigators have examined the content of novels, reports, songs, or pictures (Kobre, 1953). Other analyses have focused on syntactical units to determine the meaning of data by examining

words, phrases, or style (Coleman, 1962). Referential units have come to be seen as central to the analytic task when analysis seeks to determine how a particular person, occurrence, or idea is described in a data source (Budd & Thorp, 1963; DeCharms & Moeller, 1962). Because referential units focus primarily on words or phrases that describe the object of investigation, however, they often cannot accommodate the complexities of language. Where this level of analysis is required, propositional units have been employed to describe the structure of communication (Holsti, 1969). An even more complex analysis of the content of communication has been accomplished by the use of thematic units. Thematic units describe data sources according to their theme but, because of the difficulties involved in delineating themes reliably, their use is largely avoided (Krippendorff, 1980).

The final stage of data making involves recording the data. In early content analyses, precise recording of data was mandated by the method's preoccupation with quantification (Fox, 1969). Although content analysis is now equally concerned with qualitative analysis, formalized notations are still regarded as the means by

which "recorded texts may become explicitly meaningful" (Gerbner et al., 1969, p. 9).

Recording involves creating a permanent product detailing the relationship of recording units to their context. Records must be produced according to specific criteria and coded on data sheets in order to insure replicability of the analysis. To facilitate replicability, the recording process must be delineated as precisely and exhaustively as are the sampling, recording, and context units. Recorders should be familiar with the nature of the data being recorded and should be provided with training explaining how to use the data sheets. Furthermore, inclusion of all recorders in the development of the recording instrument is recommended to enhance both individual and inter-rater reliability (Krippendorff, 1980).

As a result of examining the complexities of recording data for content analysis, Krippendorff (1980) insists that the process can be enhanced if certain strategies are implemented. First, data sheets should contain some description of each variable. Second, the use of numbers and letters should be avoided if at all possible; check marks can be used more effectively. And finally, data sheets should

organized to reflect organizational features of the analysis.

Because the content analyst makes inferences from the recording units to their context based on what the coders have recorded on the data sheets, it is vital that data be recorded reliably. The term reliability can refer to a number of standards: stability of results over time, replicability across analysts, and accuracy of results as measured by agreement with other known data (Gravetter & Wallnau, 1985). Although accuracy is generally regarded as the strongest standard of reliability, it is rarely employed in content analyses:

In most situations in which observations, message contents, and texts are coded into the categories of a data language, the standards against which the accuracy would be established are rarely available. In content analysis it is therefore largely unrealistic to insist on this strongest reliability criterion. Data should at least be reproducible, by independent researchers, at different locations, and at different times, using the same instructions for coding the same set of data. (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 132)

To assure this kind of reliability, coders must act independently to describe recording units in like terms. For example, if the goal of a design is to categorize recording units, reliability would be assured if all coders place all recording units in

identical categories. When coders agree at a level no higher than that predicted by random coding, reliability is absent. In all content analyses, the agreement among coders must be measured to establish the reliability of the analysis (Carney, 1972; Fox, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980).

There is no absolute standard of data reliability mandated by content analysis. Clearly, the researcher seeks the highest level of reliability in data recording and attempts to maintain reliability at 80% (Gravetter & Wallnau, 1985). When independent coders do not attain that level of agreement, further examination is required. This might involve comparing occurrences of agreement and/or disagreement to the level expected by chance, analyzing specific units where disagreement occurs, focusing on the recorders as the source of disagreement, or assessing the extent to which an inadequately defined category diminishes the reliability of the recording process (Krippendorff, 1980).

Once the content analyst has selected the sample, has clearly defined both recording and context units, and delineated procedures for recording, the process of "data making" is essentially complete. Assuming that

sufficient attention has been paid to unitization and that recording has been reliably accomplished, the researcher is then free to focus on the inferences that can be drawn from data sources to their context. The kind(s) of inference(s) a researcher can draw are determined by the type of analytical construct imposed on the recorded data (Gerbner et al., 1969).

An analytical construct makes operational what the analyst knows about the relationship of data to its context. It stipulates how data are measured and have implications for recording. Selection of a particular type of analysis prescribes the kinds of inferences a researcher makes and thus limits what can be inferred about data in relationship to its context. "In its most simple form, an analytical construct is a collection of if-then statements . . . (that) may also be characterized as a theory about a context" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 99). Because analytical constructs produce a theory about the data's context only after the data are analyzed, the initial selection of a particular analytical construct cannot be justified on the basis of the immediate research. Instead, the content analyst must turn to external

sources to demonstrate the applicability of a particular analytical construct.

Individual researchers have cited a number of justifications for specific analytical constructs but tend to agree that past successes are the most reliable sources of certainty (Budd & Thorp, 1963). Where past application is unavailable, content analysts have relied on what is known about established analytical techniques to assess their potential value to new designs. In doing so, they have focused on techniques appropriate to a variety of research methodologies.

Content analysts have employed a number of analytical techniques. They have used measures of absolute and relative frequency to make inferences about the meaning and/or contextual significance of data (Fox, 1969; Holsti, 1969). When content analysis has been designed to make inferences about relationships of data either within the analysis or to data obtained from another source, standards of correlation have been employed. Multivariate analysis has been useful when the measurement represents complex, multidimensional data. Contingency analysis has made it possible to draw inferences based on the co-occurrence of recording units within a sampling unit

(Osgood, 1959), and discriminant analysis has been used to make inferences about a person's image or the portrayal of an event (Krippendorff, 1980). In using any one of these analytical techniques, the content analyst strives to meet the standards imposed by each.

Regardless of the type of analysis used to make inferences in content analysis, the researcher is ultimately concerned with its validity. Validity has been used in educational research literature to refer to a constellation of attributes of research that, if present, would support the "correctness" of the inferences drawn from the data (Borg & Gall, 1983). A content analyses is considered "valid to the extent its inferences are upheld in the face of independently obtained evidence" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 155). In their 1963 review of content analysis literature, however, Budd and Thorp noted a lack of concern with validity issues among content analysts, and Krippendorff has found this same casual attitude in more recent studies.

Where content analysis is narrowly conceived, it is possible to attribute this situation to the lack of independent sources of validation (Budd & Thorp, 1963). According to Krippendorff (1980), however, it is more

plausibly explained by the "trilemma" of direct validation: The methodological difficulties involved in obtaining direct validation often prevent content analysts from producing validated studies. To resolve this situation, the content analyst may choose to employ indirect validation and justify procedures and categories on the basis of existing theory.

In summary, content analysis is an appropriate methodology for examining the relationship between the field of juvenile correctional education and various orientations to curriculum theory. Content analysis provides a methodology for examining the theoretical constructs influencing the delivery of educational services to incarcerated youth. It is, therefore, an appropriate and valuable approach to the necessary reexamination of the field of juvenile correctional education.

Design of the Study

This analysis employs The Journal of Correctional Education as its source of data. Reaching juvenile correctional educators throughout the world, The Journal of Correctional Education represents the field's primary vehicle for describing what occurs in

juvenile correctional classrooms and how those activities are valued. In fact, this journal is the only publication addressing these issues (Tracy, personal communication, January 30, 1991). Insofar as the articles published in this journal represent a primary source of "indigenous symbolic forms" of communication, they serve as direct links to "existing theories, models, and knowledge concerning their theoretical context" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 53).

This analysis thus employed physical sampling units. One sampling unit was defined as a single article concerned with juvenile correctional education and published in The Journal of Correctional Education between January 1980, and December 1990 (See Appendix A). To assure the adequacy of sample size, the split half technique was employed: While each sampling unit was examined independently, the total number of sampling units ($n = 54$) was examined one half at a time. Insofar as either half of the sample supported the same conclusion(s) as did analysis of the entire sample, sample size was deemed adequate.

Within these relatively large and complex sampling units, recording units were defined as statements that detail and/or explain one complete thought about

juvenile correctional education. Thus, while a sampling unit contained many individual statements about juvenile correctional education, if all statements related to only one idea about the field, only one context unit was noted on the recording or coding form. However, if the sampling unit contained statements that addressed a variety of ideas about the field and/or activity being described, the recording form reflected a number a context units within a single sampling unit.

The recording units are described by the context units detailed on the recording form (See Appendix B). Context units are drawn from the literature about curriculum theory and represent the major categories of thought (i.e., ways of thinking about curriculum) described by curriculum theorists. A complete discussion of the context units is contained in Chapter III.

For the purposes of this analysis, the size of the context units was not a significant variable. This examination was concerned solely with the direction of the bias evident in juvenile correctional education literature as it identified the major category of

curriculum thought into which a particular sampling unit fell.

Each recording unit was noted as falling into a particular context unit by a check mark on the recording form. On the recording form used by the coders, context units were arranged according to descriptions of knowledge, of activity, and of value rather than by type of curriculum theory described. This arrangement was employed to minimize any coder bias which might result from the labeling of context units by theoretical orientation. Following completion of the recording forms by the coders, the correspondences between recording and context units identified on each recording form was transferred to a revised recording form (See Appendix D) to facilitate analysis of the correspondences in terms of their association with empirical-analytic, hermeneutic, and critical theory.

A sampling unit was defined as reflecting a particular category of curriculum thought when at least 95% of the check marks on the recording form were present in that section of the revised recording form. As long as the coder(s) identified the recording units of a particular sampling unit as corresponding to

context units within the same category of curriculum theory, the sampling unit was described as associated with that orientation to curriculum. The fact that one recorder may have checked one context unit while another recorder checked a different context unit within that same category of theory was thus not considered significant to this research. Because the categories of curriculum theory into which the context units are organized did not overlap, the differences in the recorders' interpretations of recording units within a category of context units did not interfere with the goal of classifying the recording and sampling units according to their context in curriculum theory.

In addition to checking the points of correspondence between the recording units and the content of the sampling units, recorders used the recording form to note any comments about the sampling unit. The comments were required in the event of ambiguities in sampling units. In addition, the comments were useful in analyzing sources of disagreement among recorders.

Three recorders were selected to complete the recording forms. Although all of the recorders were educators, they were not necessarily familiar with

either juvenile correctional education or with the literature describing curriculum theory. Training of all recorders included receipt of the coding instructions (See Appendix C). The recorders also had the opportunity to read a detailed explanation of the major conceptions of curriculum described in Chapter III of this study. In addition, all three recorders had the opportunity to discuss the recording form, the coding instructions, and the content of Chapter III both prior to and following a pilot study.

The reliability of the recording process was assessed during two stages of the analysis. A pilot study was conducted after the investigator (Coder A) examined 10 sampling units. Four units were then selected by a second recorder (Coder B). The coders checked points of correspondence between recording units and the context units listed on the recording form. Throughout the study, one form was used for each sampling unit.

Consistency and agreement were established with a 90% rate of agreement among coders. To assure reliability at this level, all sources of disagreement (i.e., mismatches or differences in context units identified on the recording form) were analyzed. The

agreement coefficient was calculated for each sampling unit exhibiting disagreement among coders. Where significant discrepancies (i.e., an agreement coefficient less than 90%) appeared among coders in regard to checking sampling unit correspondence to categories of curriculum thought, analysis of the data assumed that "the lowest agreement measure in the set is the best indicator of the reliability of the data" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 146).

Reliability was assessed a second time when the coders completed the recording of data for all sampling units. Recorder A examined all of the sampling units. Coder B repeated the recording process for eight sampling units randomly selected from the sample. A third recorder (Coder C) completed the recording process by randomly selecting four of the sampling units from the sample used by Recorder B. Reliability was acceptable at 90%. Agreement coefficients were calculated for sampling units exhibiting disagreement among the coders. In order to draw inferences and analyze data obtained from the recording forms, frequency was employed as the index of the correspondences between recording and context units to

determine which orientation to curriculum theory was reflected in each sampling unit.

Data analysis addressed the validity of the study by employing indirect means. This was necessary in the absence of studies capable of providing direct validation. In assessing the validity of the study, the investigator justified procedures and categories on the basis of existing theory. Particular attention was paid to what is known about the influence of categories of curriculum thought on general education practices, teacher training, curriculum development, and instructional practices.

Upon completion of the data analysis, conclusions were drawn concerning the categories of curriculum theory most influential in the field of juvenile correctional education. Final analysis included discussion of the implications of this bias. Possible directions for further research are also recommended.

Chapter III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Curriculum was first recognized as a distinct field of educational thought following the publication of Franklin Bobbitt's The Curriculum and Clarence Kingsley's Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education in 1918 (Kliebard, 1975b). Relatively new among the academic disciplines, the field remains in a "rather formative condition" (Macdonald, 1975b, p. 5) where the norm is "not consensus, stability, and agreement but conflict, instability, and disagreement" (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 149). At the level of practice, the field is thus characterized by an "uncritical propensity for novelty and change" (Kliebard, 1975b, p. 41). And at the level of theory, there is "a continuing search for a center to fix and ground thinking . . . about curriculum" (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 135).

The continuing efforts of curriculum theorists to define the purpose and parameters of the field have revealed two broad areas of disagreement: First, curriculum theorists do not agree on the purpose of curriculum theorizing. At the 1973 Rochester Conference, George Beauchamp and others argued for a

limited area of inquiry emphasizing an empirical-analytical approach while James Macdonald and Michael Apple urged a delimited field in which the "legitimacy of several approaches" was encouraged (Pinar, 1974, p. v). In its limited form, curriculum theory is understood as an empirical method, as "a basis for prescription or as an empirically testable set of principles and relationships" functioning as a guide to curriculum development (Macdonald, 1975b, p. 6; Mann, 1975). In its delimited form, however, curriculum theory is seen not as this narrow and normative knowledge-producing field but rather as a creative, environment-producing field (Huebner, 1975). It is understood as a dynamic intellectual activity able to "develop and criticize conceptual schema" (Macdonald, 1975b, p. 6), to determine "how students develop meanings from their educational environments" (Willis, 1975, p. 440), and to "call attention to the tools used in shaping" the field (Huebner, 1975, p. 269).

If curriculum theorists have not always agreed on the nature of curriculum theorizing, neither have they agreed on a definition of curriculum itself. Within the literature about curriculum, the term is used to refer to everything from "a series of experiences which

children and youth must have by way of obtaining objectives" (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 42) to "possibilities for individuals" and "varying perspectives through which all kinds of people can view their own lived worlds" (Greene, 1974, p. 69). The type of definition of curriculum employed often corresponds to the conception of curriculum theory evidenced: Those theorists who understand curriculum theory in its most limited, prescriptive, and empirical form define the field in terms of discrete training experiences designed to remediate "the shortcomings of individuals" (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 45). Theorists who describe the purpose of theorizing in terms of reconceptualizing the field tend toward broader definitions of curriculum in which the nature, value, and implications of the curricular experiences are central (Huebner, 1975; Mann, 1975; Willis, 1975).

Given the disagreement about both the definition of curriculum and the purpose of curriculum theorizing, a number of scholars have attempted to impose order on the various approaches. This has resulted in a number of taxonomies designed to identify similarities and differences among orientations to curriculum studies. While James B. Macdonald has classified curriculum

theories according to function (curriculum design, empirical research, or reconstruction), he has also emphasized the importance of the approach to values in curriculum theory (1977). Dwayne Huebner (1975, p. 223) also reflects this approach to theory by citing "five value frameworks or systems: technical, political, scientific, esthetic, (and) ethical" differentiating approaches to curriculum studies.

William Pinar (1975b) and Robert Starratt (1974) explain significant similarities in approaches to curriculum studies in terms of historical and/or philosophical orientation. Pinar distinguished four approaches to curriculum thought: existentialist (Donald Bateman (1974), Maxine Greene (1974), William Pinar (1975b); traditionalist (Hilda Taba, J. Harlan Shores, Ralph W. Tyler, B. Othanel Smith); conceptual empiricist (George Beauchamp, Ian Decker, Mauritz Johnson); and reconstructionist (Michael Apple, William Kliebard, John Mann). In Robert Starratt's (1974) approach to the categorization of curriculum theory, curriculum theorists are classified as behaviorists (Benjamin Bloom) or humanists (Maxine Greene; Dwayne Huebner, James B. Macdonald). They are committed to Jean Jacques Rousseau's concept of personal individual

freedom or to Thomas Hobbes' emphasis on the need for social adaptation. And they can be described as either academicians committed to the intellectual rigor of the liberal arts tradition or as moralists devoted to the education of the whole child.

While focusing his analysis on only these three orientations to curriculum theory, Starratt (1974) acknowledged that other theoretical positions remained unexamined. In the spring of 1988, William Schubert, Ann Schubert, Leslie Herzog, George Posner, and Craig Kridel developed "A Genealogy of Curriculum Researchers" to categorize theoretical orientations according to the mentoring relationship(s) enjoyed by over 400 curriculum theorists. Cleo Cherryholmes (1988) has offered yet another approach to curriculum studies by classifying curriculum theory as either structuralist or post-structuralist.

Although these efforts to organize and provide a framework for the examination of curriculum theory have failed to produce any one universally accepted definition of the field, they have established some common ground: First, the major curriculum theorists agree that thinking about curriculum involves considering what students do and do not have an

opportunity to learn in school (Eisner, 1979). Second, they agree that: (a) At some point curriculum must be concerned with what is learned, and that (b) What is learned should be true (Cherryholmes, 1988; Macdonald, 1977; Tyler, 1949; Young, 1990). Whether this is expressed in terms of Kingsley's (1918, p. 9) view of curriculum as an "uplifting . . . agent of social progress" or by Huebner's (1975, p. 222) concern with "What can go on in the classroom?" and "How can this activity be valued?", curriculum theorists agree that attention to what is learned is a central task of curriculum theory.

Curriculum theory can thus be understood as a "grouping or clustering of general ideas or propositions" about what students learn in school (Gutek, 1988, p. 251). In other words, "curriculum theory itself . . . is highly general explanatory statements" about epistemology (i.e., the nature of knowledge), ontology (i.e., human "being"), and axiology (i.e., the value of the experience) (Macdonald, 1977; Mann, 1975, p. 162).

Recent efforts to clarify curriculum's approach to knowledge, activities, and values have relied on the works of the contemporary German theorist, Jurgen

Habermas (Habermas, 1971; Macdonald, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1977; Young, 1990). In his most famous work, Knowledge and Human Interest (1971), Habermas "argued that knowledge was created in communities of inquiry, guided by sets of rules or conventions . . . expressive of three deep-seated anthropological interests of the human species, in control, in understanding and in freedom from dogma" (Young, 1990, p. 32). Extension of these interests into the realm of curriculum distinguishes three types of theory: (a) The empirical-analytical approach reflecting "a technical cognitive interest in control," (b) The hermeneutic-historical approach reflecting "a practical cognitive interest in consensus," and (c) The self-reflective, critical approach reflecting a "cognitive interest in emancipation or liberation" (Macdonald, 1975a, p. 287; McCarthy, 1978).

The empirical-analytic approach is the most influential orientation to curriculum thought. Its interest in "technical control over objectified process" (Habermas, 1971, pp. 308-309) is evidenced in both the works of the "field's most important early members--Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, Edward L. Thorndike, Ross L. Finney," Clarence Kingsley, and

Ralph Tyler and the contemporary preoccupation with behavioral objectives, measurable outcomes, efficient instructional methods, and classroom management techniques (Apple, 1979, p. 68). Its legacy has formed not only the foundation of modern teacher training but also the basis for much of contemporary criticism (Kliebard, 1975c).

Empirical-analytic theory first defined itself against the background of World War I nationalism, the desire to uplift the masses and "Americanize" immigrants, and the requirements of a rapidly industrializing economy (Kliebard, 1975b). As its early voices struggled to meet the social and economic challenges of a new era, the goal of curriculum studies was defined as the development of "a high degree of normative and cognitive consensus among the elements of society" (Apple, 1979, p. 69). By maintaining the primacy of "social attitudes and valuations" in the development of "large group consciousness," curriculum was defined rather narrowly (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 162). The purpose of curricular experiences was to "develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place" (Kingsley, 1918, p. 7). And the purpose of curriculum

theory was "to produce prescriptions for maximizing certain allegedly desirable effects" (Mann, 1975, p. 162).

Empirical-analytic theory was thus first and foremost oriented toward practice. In thinking about the kinds of practice that would produce the assimilated and diversified human labor society required, the early curriculum theorists abandoned the doctrine and methods of mental discipline advocated by earlier theorists. Instead, they adopted an ahistorical perspective rooted in positivism, the scientific method, the principles of scientific management, and the efficiency of technology (Kliebard, 1975a). It was the acceptance of this perspective that ultimately defined the way empirical-analytic theory conceptualizes knowledge, activities, and values.

"Logical positivism--namely, that only empirically quantifiable and measurable matters will yield truth--appears to be a basic . . . bias" of control theory (Maslow, 1971; Starratt, 1974, p. 24). "By its doctrine of evidence" positivism limited the definition of truth to that which could be quantified and measured through "sensory experience" (Young, 1990, p. 19). In empirical-analytic theory, knowledge thus became

synonymous with observable and measurable behavior(s), and the performance of a series of behaviors was viewed as evidence of knowledge. Knowledge came to be regarded as separate "beads of information" relevant to discrete subject areas (Macdonald, 1971, p. 238; Macdonald & Wolfson, 1970). And activities were viewed as work to be task analyzed into separate and specific components.

The positivist tendency to understand knowledge and activities in terms of their "isolated particulars" was reinforced by the principles of scientific management (Polanyi, 1966; Taylor, 1911). In this model, efficiency occupies central position. The individual is simply a component of the production system, and the purpose of thinking about activities is to fragment, analyze, and reorder them "into the most efficient arrangement possible (Kliebard, 1975a, p. 54). Control theory thus objectifies "human beings as things" (Young, 1990, p. 19) and defines both teaching and learning as a logically sequenced, rational set of activities that "can be reorganized and thus made more efficient and controllable" (Bowers, 1982, p. 531).

The positivist "view of rationalism as the basic mode of knowing" dictates that the component parts of knowledge and activity must be logically sequenced (Bowers, 1982, p. 529). However, controlled progress toward predetermined ends becomes possible only if knowledge is acquired both sequentially and efficiently: "What we need to do is teach (have children learn) more (and better) in less time and at earlier ages" (Macdonald & Wolfson, 1970, p. 199).

As this perspective meshed with the technical concern for cost effectiveness and a differentiated standard product, the result was a theory of curriculum that mandated the differentiation of predetermined educational objectives and the measurement of product outcomes against the criteria of efficiency and standardization. Thus even

The essence of the Tyler rationale" was not curriculum planning "but the embodiment of the production model of how the process of teaching and learning proceeds: State the design specifications for how we want the learner to behave and then try to find the most efficient methods for producing that product quickly and cheaply." (Kliebard, 1975b, p. 45)

Evaluate only those outcomes stated in the design objectives (Macdonald, 1977), and ensure a differentially standard product according to the given

needs of the social economy (Apple, 1979; Bobbitt, 1918).

Both positivism and the principles of scientific management and technology accepted the linear expert model. In curriculum theory this was reflected in a focus on the tasks of the practitioner and the relationship of the teacher to the student (Pinar, 1975b). The teacher was defined as a person who stands apart from the student but who "comes to know the student . . . (and) makes judgements about" both what knowledge the student needs and what activities are most appropriate. This implies "an end point which only the teacher has access to and only the teacher has arrived at. Thus the predominant rationality of the teacher is still a technical process of planning, manipulating, and calculating" (Macdonald, 1974, pp. 112-113). The process of planning, organizing, and evaluating outcomes is carried out by stipulating design specifications based on narrowly defined categories of behaviors. These behaviors are "discretely discernible and quantifiable" activities based not on the broad categories described by early behaviorism but on the narrow conception of long-range ends reflective of acceptable adult social roles

(Kliebard, 1975b; Starratt, 1974; Willis, 1975, p. 427). Conceptually, means and ends are thus separated; students must proceed through a standardized series of activities despite the fact that the teacher responsible for developing, organizing, and evaluating those activities has no knowledge of the long-range ends for any particular student.

Control theory is thus concerned with establishing "empirically verifiable links between teacher-student interaction, prescribed course sequences, and logical and rationally definable states of knowledge and learning" (Starratt, 1974, p. 17). Having accepted a "technological rationale for learning," the empirical-analytic approach relies heavily on the use of behavioral objectives, programmed learning, and outcomes-based assessment in its approach to the knowledge and activities central to the curricular experience (Bowers, 1982; Macdonald & Wolfson, 1970). It assumes a separation of teacher from students and of means from ends. And its assertion that the "behavior of individuals" must be "controlled in an effort to make people do particular things" assumes a "deterministic outlook " on human being (Kliebard, 1975a, p. 67).

A. H. Maslow has described the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum as "positivistic, behavioristic, objectivistic, derived from the study of things, value-free, value-neutral, and thus illegitimately used for the study of human beings" (1971, p. 170).

Although many contemporary curriculum theorists would agree with the substance of Maslow's criticism, neither Macdonald (1975a) nor Young (1990) would agree with his conception of values in empirical-analytic curriculum theory. Habermas has noted that "the empirical-analytic sciences develop their theories in a self-understanding that automatically generates continuity with the beginnings of philosophical thought. For both . . . share the cosmological intention of describing the universe in its lawlike order, just as it is" (1971, p. 302).

The empirical-analytic science's tendency to accept the world as it is reflected in much of curriculum theory. When Bobbitt was asked, "What should a superintendent actually do by way of improving curriculum in his schools?", his answer was, "He should accept the situation in his city as it is. He should look upon it as . . . normal, and therefore proper, . . . proper, . . . (and) therefore accept the

conditions as right and good" (1918, p. 285). Even as Tyler (1949) recognized more clearly than Bobbitt the need to "screen" values, he did not advocate explicit analysis of the impact of values on curriculum development or theory. Thus the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum theory reflects the bias of the status quo: It accepts existing social values implicitly as it pursues the improved effectiveness of instruction in reaching predefined cognitive understandings and skill levels sequenced in behavioral objectives (Apple, 1979; Dewey, 1966; Starratt, 1974).

Another conception of human being, knowledge, and values is represented in the practical cognitive interest of the hermeneutic-historical approach to curriculum theory. Hermeneutics focuses on "the art of textual interpretation" (McCarthy, 1978, p. 169). Its influence can be found in curriculum theory concerned with qualitative assessment of "how students develop meanings from their educational environments" (Willis, 1975, p. 433). And although its proponents argue the advantages of this conception of curriculum over the empirical-analytic approach, the fact that the consensus approach has failed to produce a body of work directed toward practice has limited its appeal

(Macdonald, 1977). Moreover, Habermas (1971) views the hermeneutic approach as very much the counterpart of the more traditional model in terms of its understanding of knowledge and values.

Insofar as hermeneutics is concerned with "mutual understanding in the conduct of life," its activities are necessarily dialogical (Macdonald, 1975c, p. 126). Curriculum is thus viewed as a process of self-formation attained as a result of dialogue, communication, negotiation, and confrontation with other. Its activities focus on the "accomplishment, development, and risk of intersubject understanding" (Jardine, 1988, p. 27). Employing what James Macdonald (1975c, p. 292) refers to as the "circular (grass roots) consensus model," school staff and community members engage in a group process in order to reach consensus in regard to action.

Hermeneutic curricular activity does not stem from any predetermined understanding of sequential engagement

Since it is exactly where one stands in relation to others, risked in the orientation toward mutual understanding, that is at issue. . . . Hermeneutics does not thereby produce an univocal technical understanding which expresses control, manipulation and prediction. . . . Rather it . . . expresses the tensions, risks and

possibilities inherent in the struggle for mutual understanding." (Jardine, 1988, p. 27)

Thus it is reciprocal communication rather than the imposition of the teacher's view of how that learning should be acquired that guides curricular activity (Young, 1990).

While hermeneutics poses a different orientation toward activity than does the linear expert model of the empirical-analytic sciences, the two approaches are similar in that in both, "knowing appears central" (Macdonald, 1975a, p. 291). But because hermeneutics is concerned with interpretation rather than with predictive control, Habermas describes the hermeneutic conception of knowledge as reflecting the "practical cognitive interest, in contrast to the technical" (1971, p. 310; Young, 1990). "Here the meaning of the validity of propositions is not constituted in the frame of reference of technical control. . . . Access to the facts is provided by the understanding of meaning, not observation" (Habermas, 1971, p. 309). Thus while technical knowledge may result from the search for meaning, it is only a possibility to be considered among others (Jardine, 1988).

According to Habermas (1971), this practical cognitive interest directs the understanding of meaning "toward the attainment of possible consensus among actors in the framework of a self-understanding derived from tradition" (1971, p. 310). The goal is self-formation via the resolution of conflicts between social expectations. Dialogue is directed toward the study of problems and their ultimate resolution.

Insofar as these expectations and problems are drawn from the social reality, however, the hermeneutic approach to curriculum "does not penetrate behind the facade of the existing culture or system of meaning as a product of communal or social objectification" (Young, 1990, p. 33). It pursues meaning "against the reflected appropriation of active tradition" (Habermas, 1971, p. 316). Moreover, because knowledge is acquired by a dialogical process rooted in language necessarily reflective of existing conditions, the meaning derived from the consensus-building process reflects the status quo. Hermeneutic theory's reliance on socially determined language thus produces an approach to curriculum that reinforces empirical-analytic theory in "regard to their practical consequences" (Habermas, 1971, p. 316).

The manipulative ethos of a larger society is found within curriculum discourse in the basic . . . treatment of language and categories used for even conceiving of educational relationships. It thereby creates and reinforces patterns of interaction that not only reflect but actually embody the interests in certainty and control. (Apple, 1975, p. 140)

Habermas (1971) describes one additional orientation to curriculum theory. In the emancipatory interest of critical theory, he finds an approach to knowledge, activity, and values reflecting the critical potential of education. In this regard, Habermas is only one in a long list of theorists who have sought to reconceive curriculum as something other than an objective, knowledge-producing field (McCarthy, 1978; Pinar, 1975b; Young, 1990). In this approach, thinking about curriculum is understood as a creative intellectual task rather than "a basis for prescription or as an empirically testable set of principles and relationships." Seeking understanding beyond prediction or consensus, critical theory intends to "develop and criticize conceptual schema to arrive at new ways of talking about curriculum and to develop alternative modes of thinking" (Macdonald, 1975c, p. 6).

Pinar describes critical theory as concerned with the nature of the inner experience, "the experience of the educational journey; it is the study of curriculum reconceived" (1975a, p. 399). He refers to critical theorists as reconstructionists and notes two functionally different kinds of work: criticism of existing theory exemplified by the works of Michael Apple, William Kliebard, and John Mann, and the post-critical analysis found in the writings of Jurgen Habermas (1971) and Paulo Freire (1970; 1973). In both kinds of work, however, Pinar cites a fundamental interest in understanding the nature of the educational experience as a result of continual critique and reconstruction of the past (Kliebard, 1975b).

Paulo Freire understands "the raison d'etre" of critical theory "in its drive toward reconciliation" of the contradictions inherent in education (1970, p. 59). The critical approach to identifying and examining these contradictions is drawn from the methods of historical, philosophical, and literary criticism. It relies on existentialism and phenomenology to provide the "conceptual tools" by which the "human experience in education" can be understood (Pinar, 1975b, p. xiii). The critical theorist's focus thus moves

beyond observable and measurable behavior and the work of the practitioner to a broader field concerned with consciousness, politics, historical and cultural developments, and the intellectual foundations of western thought.

While critical theory does not reject all empirical methods, it does criticize their narrow focus and objectivist stance. It critiques the overextension of empirical-analytic methodology and the "unreflexive self-understanding" it embodies as too limited for "human studies" and calls attention to the inherent bias of a body of research that uncritically adopts "conceptual frameworks and takes on directions with ideological implications in a given society." Similarly, critical theory finds the hermeneutic approach too confining, its attempts to derive meaning from the given reality too normative and prone to manipulation. And while critical theorists have noted that "interpretive science is often coupled with critique, it is not the same thing. Critique goes beyond interpretation . . . and raises questions about the circumstances under which it is, or is not, morally acceptable to treat people as things to be manipulated" (Young, 1990, p. 74).

Critical theorists reflect Huebner's view of curriculum as "a field of translation and application" (Pinar, 1975b, p. 75) within which the theorist uncovers specific problems, describes alternatives, examines the limitations of methods, and "generally contributes towards the development of a more valid and balanced view of the state of the art, free from dogmatism" (Young, 1990, p. 133). Knowledge is thus understood as emerging, contestable, and tentative. Unlike the empirical-analytic and hermeneutic conception of knowledge as certain, absolute, and impersonal, critical theory reflects the more current understanding of knowledge as uncertain and relative, personal, and functional (Macdonald & Wolfson, 1970). It thus rejects the tendency to view knowledge "as a finished product, towards a mistaking of the contemporary surface of things for their full range of possibilities and states, and towards a view that . . . is not . . . personal and nonrational" (Young, 1990, p. 82).

For the critical theorists, it is the value of the experience rather than knowledge that occupies central position. By continually examining and reconstructing curriculum thought, critical theorists become "aware of

ideas and forces that have helped shape their field and their thinking" (Kliebard, 1975b, p. 39). And this awareness is evident in the explicit examination of the values that contribute to the "selection of variables, ethical theories, etc. that go into developing designs" (Macdonald, 1975a, p. 291). Thus in contrast to other theoretical acceptance of existing systems as descriptively given, critical theory accepts the need to examine values beyond the theoretical horizon (Habermas, 1971):

What are the tasks of the curriculum theorists? As is true of all theorists his task is to lay bare the structure of his being-in-the-world and to articulate this structure through the language and the environmental forms that he creates. . . . It is necessary that he be conscious of his man-made equipment, his languages, his environmental forms. To be aware of these man-made forms is to be aware of their history, their sources in human activity and intention. . . . All educators attempt to shape the world; theorists should call attention to the tools used for the shaping. (Huebner, 1975, p. 269)

The explicit examination of values central to critical theory is carried out in the process of curricular activity. Embedded in the cognitive interest in emancipation, critical theory defines the purpose of this activity as "freeing people from limitations and creating new conditions and environments" (Macdonald, 1975a, p. 291). This is

accomplished by a dialogue process from which the curriculum emerges and in which the learner assumes as active role (Freire, 1973). Whether reflected as concern with the development of individual potential, self-realization, or empowerment, critical theory emphasizes the need for the learner to play an active role in his or her education, to be the subject of his or her own learning (Wallerstein, 1988).

In making the student the subject of his or her own learning, critical theory rejects the "banking concept" of curricular activity in which the student is seen as an empty vessel to be filled by the teacher's knowledge (Freire, 1970). Instead, students, teachers, community members, and other interested parties engage in dialogue concerning what should be learned and how learning will take place. The goal is to create an educational environment via social exchange with others (Wallerstein, 1988). Critical theory thus rejects what Karl Marx (1972) criticized as "education from above" and replaces the linear expert and consensual expert models with group dialogue.

The conception of curricular activity in critical theory views students and teachers as co-learners. As they engage in the dialogue that guides activity, the

goal is "critical thinking or posing problems in such a way as to uncover root causes of one's place in society --the socio-economic, political, cultural, and historical context of personal lives" (Wallerstein, 1988, p. 55). This process empowers the participants to take an active role in their education and in their communities. It encourages the co-learners to effect personal and social change by engaging them in the process of identifying their own problems and formulating their own solutions. Curricular activity becomes meaningful, therefore, because students and teachers "have choices, opportunities to share, [and] engagement with profound ideas" in a process related to the pupil's personal meaning as well as to the community in which he or she lives (Raths, 1969).

Critical theory views curriculum in terms of the "possibilities for individuals" offered by "varying perspectives through which all kinds of people can view their own lived worlds . . . as self-determining human beings existing with others in intersubjective community" (Greene, 1974, p. 69). Curriculum is defined not as a predictive and rational science nor as a consensus producing activity. It is rooted neither in the need to control nor in the interest in

understanding. The purpose of thinking about curriculum is something more than ordering or agreeing upon correct responses to given realities: It provides the opportunity for co-learners to order "the materials of the world . . . by means of experiences and perspectives made available for personally conducted cognitive action" (p. 299). It is "the personal need in everyday life" that is the substance of education and the meaning of the curricular experience that is the central focus of curriculum theory (Macdonald, 1975c, p. 82; Small, 1978).

In summary, curriculum remains a dynamic field characterized by debate, conflict, and reconstruction. Within its rather broad and ill-defined parameters, its major theorists have identified and ordered a number of theoretical orientations. Despite the differing taxonomies that have resulted from these efforts, curriculum theorists agree that in both its theoretical discourse and practical application, curriculum is concerned with knowledge, being, and values. It is in regard to these elements of curriculum theory that Jurgen Habermas's (1971) categorization is of value. Habermas distinguishes three distinct approaches to knowledge, being, and values in the orientations of

control theory, hermeneutic theory, and critical theory.

For the correctional educator seeking to reexamine the field of juvenile correctional education within the framework of curriculum theory, Habermas's categorization of curriculum theory is particularly useful. It proposes a framework within which the fundamental concern with knowledge, being, and values can be categorized according to theoretical orientation. And this provides the context within which juvenile correctional educators can examine current ideas and practices.

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The results of a content analysis of juvenile correctional education literature are presented in this chapter. Fifty-four articles published in The Journal of Correctional Education were analyzed to determine their points of correspondence to three distinct orientations to curriculum theory. The purpose of this effort was to identify the orientation(s) to curriculum theory that have influenced the practice of education in juvenile correctional settings.

The Pilot Study

Prior to coding the entire sample of articles, 10 articles were examined and coded on recording forms by the investigator (Coder A). Four of these recording units were then randomly selected and coded by Coder B. The purpose of the pilot study was twofold: to examine the extent to which each context unit was clearly defined and differentiated from other context units on the recording form, and to assess the reliability of data recorded.

The pilot study yielded 100% agreement between two coders for 9 of the 10 sampling units: Both coders recorded correspondence between recording and context units with identical recording forms. However, written comments on the recording forms indicated that several context units reflected descriptors so similar that difficulties were encountered in deciding which context unit most closely corresponded to an idea expressed in the recording unit. As a result, several context units were combined and/or reworded to enhance the discrete nature of each unit. In addition, descriptions of several context units were enhanced by including additional description on the recording form.

For the entire sample of 10 units, coding revealed 9 articles in which all points of correspondence were recorded as reflecting conceptions of curriculum theory associated with empirical-analytic theory (See Appendix D). In coding the 10th article, Coder A found 1 point of correspondence reflective of critical theory and 16 points reflecting empirical-analytic theory. Coder B recorded 16 context units reflecting empirical-analytic theory. Thus, one of the 33 recognized context units, or 3%, fell into the category of critical theory. With 97% of the recognized context units reflecting

empirical-analytic theory, the recording unit was considered reflective of this orientation to curriculum theory.

The reliability of the data was calculated using the formula for determining the agreement coefficient for dichotomous data recorded by two or more coders:

$$\text{agreement coefficient} = 1 - \frac{(2r - 1) \text{ number of mismatching units}}{n_0 n_1}$$

where r = the number of context units, n_1 = the number of recorded correspondences between recording and context units, and n_0 = number of non-correspondences (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 140). Analysis of the sampling unit in question revealed an agreement coefficient of 0.9385 indicating that in about 94% of the cases, "the observed co-occurrences are explainable by the pattern of perfect agreement rather than by what would be expected by chance, or, for short, observed co-occurrences are . . . (94%) above chance" (p. 139). With sources of agreement at this level, it was determined that even considering the small size of the pilot study sample, the data were sufficiently reliable to proceed with the study.

The Sample

The sample consisted of 54 articles about juvenile correctional education published in The Journal of Correctional Education between January 1980 and December 1990. Each article represented one sampling unit containing many recording units (i.e., statements about juvenile correctional education). The sampling units examined by Coders B and C were randomly selected from the total sample. Upon completion of the recording forms by all three coders, each recording form was numbered to indicate its association with the 54 sampling units.

Data Collection

Three coders recorded points of correspondence between recording units in the 54 sampling units and context units describing conceptions of knowledge, activity, and values in curriculum theory. Points of correspondence were recorded on recording forms and indicated by a check mark to the left of the appropriate context unit. A separate recording form was used by each coder for each sampling unit examined (See Appendix B).

After each recording form was completed, the data were transferred to a revised recording form (See Appendix D). On this second form, context units referring to each type of theory were grouped together. This was undertaken to facilitate analysis of the identified context units according to the type of theory reflected.

Coder A examined each of the 54 articles. Coder B recorded data for 8 articles randomly selected from this sample. Coder C recorded data for four recording units randomly selected from the sample examined by Coder B. Thus 8 of the 54 articles were mutually coded while 4 were examined by all three coders to allow 66 recording instances.

Recorded Data

Points of correspondence between recording units in the sample and the context units describing empirical-analytic, hermeneutic, and/or critical curriculum theory were identified in all 54 of the sampling units. The fewest number of context units identified as reflecting one or more recording units in any one article was 1 ($n = 2$); the greatest number was 17 ($n = 1$).

Each of the 16 context units related to empirical-analytic theory was identified as describing a recording unit at least once. Two of the 7 context units (28.57%) describing the hermeneutic approach were identified one or more times. Among the 9 context units describing the critical approach to curriculum, 5, or 44.44%, were noted as corresponding to one or more recording units. Thus of all 32 context units, 23, or 71.88%, were identified as corresponding to at least one recording unit while 28.13% were not recognized in any of the sampling units (See Table A, Appendix E).

The coders identified correspondences between recording and context units a total of 446 times. Four hundred and twenty-six correspondences, or 95.52%, involved context units associated with empirical-analytic theory. Six correspondences to context units associated with the hermeneutic approach accounted for 1.35% of the occurrences. And 14 correspondences with context units reflecting critical theory represented an additional 3.14%.

Coder A recorded correspondences between recording and context units 330 times. Context units associated with empirical-analytic theory ($n = 320$) accounted for 96.97% of the occurrences. Context units reflecting

the hermeneutic approach ($n = 3$) represented 0.91% of the identifications. The remaining 2.12% of the identifications were context units describing critical theory. Coder B recorded 81 separate correspondences: 73, or 90.12%, were to empirical-analytic context units. Three, or 3.70%, were to hermeneutic units, while 6, or 7.41%, were to context units associated with critical theory. Coder C identified correspondences between recording and context units 34 times; 33, or 97.06%, involved empirical-analytic context units. The remaining 2.94% reflected critical theory. Coder C did not identify any correspondences between recording units and context units associated with hermeneutic theory.

The sample examined by Coders A and B contained 8, or 14.82%, of all sampling units providing 16, or 24.24%, of all recording instances. Of the 160 recording units identified as corresponding to a context unit, 90.74% ($n = 137$) were associated with empirical-analytic context units, 3.09% ($n = 5$) with hermeneutic units, and 6.17% ($n = 10$) with critical context units. Coder A identified correspondences between recording and context units 80 times. Seventy-four, or 92.5%, were to empirical-analytic

context units; 2, or 2.5%, were to hermeneutic units; and 4, or 5%, were to critical units. Of the 82 correspondences identified by Coder B, 73, or 89.02%, were to empirical-analytic context units. Three, or 3.66%, were to hermeneutic units, and 6, or 7.32%, were with context units associated with critical theory.

The sample of four articles examined by all three coders represented 7.41% of all sampling units and provided 12, or 18.18%, of the recording instances. Correspondences between recording and context units were identified 101 times. In 97.03%, or 198 cases, the correspondence was to an empirical-analytic context unit. No correspondences were identified involving hermeneutic units so that the remaining 2.97% were to context units associated with critical theory. Of the 34 correspondences recorded by Coder A, 33, or 97.06%, were to empirical-analytic units, and 1, or 2.94%, was to a critical context unit. Of the 33 correspondences identified by Coder B, 96.97% ($n = 32$) were to empirical-analytic units and 3.03% ($n = 1$) to critical units. The correspondences recorded by Coder C agreed with those identified by Coder A.

In 47, or 87.04%, of the sampling units, all of the context units identified were associated with empirical-analytic curriculum theory. No points of correspondence were noted between recording units and context units associated with either hermeneutic or critical theory. In all cases, the coders identified the same context units. Four of the articles were examined by more than one coder: Three were examined by all three coders while an additional one was examined by Coders A and B. Thus 87.04% of all sampling units, 50% of the sampling units examined by Coders A and B, and 75% of the sampling units examined by all three coders, yielded correspondence only with empirical-analytic descriptors.

Data for these sampling units were recorded in 54 recording instances. Each of the 16 empirical-analytic context units was identified at least once. The total number of recordings was 289. Coder A identified correspondences between recording and context units 247 times. Coder B recorded 22 correspondences, and Coder C identified 20.

Seven of the 54 recording units, or 12.96%, of the sampling units, did not yield at least 95% of the correspondences with context units associated with any

one orientation to curriculum theory. Three of these articles were examined only by Coder A, three by Coders A and B, and one by all three coders. Thus 12.96% of the articles examined by Coder A, 50% of those examined by Coder B, and 25% of those examined by Coder C were not associated with any one type of curriculum theory.

These seven sampling units were examined 12 times by the three coders. In this 18.18% of all recording instances, correspondences were identified between recording and context units 157 times. Context units associated with empirical-analytic theory ($n = 137$) represented 87.26% of the correspondences. Those associated with hermeneutic theory ($n = 6$) and critical theory ($n = 14$) accounted for 3.82% and 8.92% respectively.

Coder A identified 83 correspondences between recording context units in this sample; 73, or 87.95%, were with empirical-analytic context units. Coder B recorded 51 of 60, or 85%, of the correspondences with empirical-analytic context units. Coder C recorded 13 of 14 correspondences, or 92.86%, with empirical-analytic context units.

Each of the seven recording forms also contained at least one correspondence with context units

associated with critical theory. Seven of the 83, or 8.43%, of Coder A's identified correspondences were to critical context units. Coder B identified 60 correspondences; 6, or 10% were with critical context units. One of the 14, or 7.14%, of the correspondences identified by Coder C was associated with the critical approach to curriculum.

Four of these sampling units also reflected context units associated with the hermeneutic approach to curriculum theory: Levels of correspondence to hermeneutic context units ranged from 3.64% ($n = 3$) for Coder A to 5% ($n = 3$) for Coder B. Coder C did not record any correspondences between hermeneutic context units and recording units in these seven sampling units.

The frequencies of correspondences between recording units identified in the sampling units and context units associated with empirical-analytic, hermeneutic, and critical curriculum theory appear in Table 1. The table contains the absolute and relative frequencies of identified correspondences in the sample ($S_n = 54$), in the 8 sampling units examined by two coders ($S_n = 8AB$), in the 4 sampling units examined by three coders ($S_n = 4ABC$), in the 47 sampling units with

Table 1

Frequency of Correspondences between Recording Units
and Context Units in the Samples

Sample	<u>Percentage of Context Units Identified</u>		
	Empirical-Analytic	Hermeneutic	Critical
$S_n = 54$			
All Coders (n = 446)	95.52 (n = 426)	1.35 (n = 6)	3.14 (n = 14)
Coder A (n = 330)	96.97 (n = 320)	0.91 (n = 3)	2.12 (n = 7)
Coder B (n = 81)	90.12 (n = 3)	3.70 (n = 3)	7.41 (n = 6)
Coder C (n = 33)	97.06 (n = 33)	-- (n = 0)	2.94 (n = 1)
$S_n = 8AB$			
All Coders (n = 162)	90.74 (n = 147)	3.09 (n = 5)	6.17 (n = 10)
Coder A (n = 80)	92.50 (n = 74)	2.50 (n = 2)	5.00 (n = 4)
Coder B (n = 82)	89.02 (n = 73)	3.66 (n = 3)	7.32 (n = 6)
$S_n = 4ABC$			
All Coders (n = 101)	97.03 (n = 98)	-- (n = 0)	2.97 (n = 3)
Coder A (n = 34)	97.06 (n = 33)	-- (n = 0)	2.94 (n = 1)
Coder B (n = 32)	96.97 (n = 32)	-- (n = 0)	3.03 (n = 1)
Coder C (n = 34)	97.06 (n = 33)	-- (n = 0)	2.94 (n = 1)
$S_n = 47$			
All Coders (n = 289)	100.00 (n = 289)	-- (n = 0)	-- (n = 0)
Coder A (n = 274)	100.00 (n = 274)	-- (n = 0)	-- (n = 0)
Coder B (n = 22)	100.00 (n = 22)	-- (n = 0)	-- (n = 0)
Coder C (n = 20)	100.00 (n = 20)	-- (n = 0)	-- (n = 0)
$S_n = 7$			
All Coders (n = 157)	87.26 (n = 137)	3.82 (n = 6)	8.92 (n = 14)
Coder A (n = 83)	87.95 (n = 73)	3.64 (n = 3)	8.43 (n = 7)
Coder B (n = 60)	85.00 (n = 51)	5.00 (n = 3)	10.00 (n = 6)
Coder C (n = 14)	92.86 (n = 13)	-- (n = 0)	7.14 (n = 1)

all correspondences to empirical-analytic context units ($S_n = 47$), and in the 7 sampling units with fewer than 95% of the correspondences associated with any one type of curriculum theory ($S_n = 7$).

Summary of the Data

The most frequently expressed conceptions of knowledge, activity, and values in this sample of juvenile correctional education literature were those associated with the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum. In the entire sample, 95.52% of the recording units identified corresponded to empirical-analytic context units. In the sample examined by Coders A and B, empirical-analytic context units represented 90.74% of the identifications. And in the sampling units examined by all three coders, 97.03% of the correspondences involved context units associated with empirical-analytic theory. The frequency of correspondences between recording units and empirical-analytic context units ranged from 89.02% of the correspondences identified by Coder B in the sample examined by Coders A and B to 97.06% of the correspondences identified by both Coder A and Coder C from the sample identified by all three coders.

Sampling units were assessed as reflecting a specific orientation to curriculum theory if 95% or more of the correspondences between its recording units were to context units associated with a particular category of theory. Forty-seven, or 87.04%, of the sampling units met this criterion. In these sampling units, 100% of the correspondences involved empirical-analytic context units. All of these sampling units were coded identically, i.e., each of the coders identified the same context units as describing thoughts expressed in the sampling unit's recording units. There was thus 100% agreement that 87.04% of the articles examined reflected the influence of empirical-analytic theory.

Seven of the sampling units examined did not reflect any one orientation to curriculum theory. In this sample, association with empirical-analytic context units was still more apparent than association with either hermeneutic or critical context units: If correspondences to context units associated with any one theory are examined in relationship to the total number of correspondences identified by any one or more coders in any sample, the lowest percentage of correspondences to empirical-analytic context units is

87.26 while the highest percentage associated with either hermeneutic or critical theory is 10%.

In summary, 87.04% of the articles examined expressed ideas consistent with the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum. No references to hermeneutic or critical theory were identified in these sampling units. The other 12.98% of the sampling units failed to reflect any one orientation to curriculum although references to the empirical-analytic approach were more frequent than references to either hermeneutic or critical theory.

The frequency of correspondence to empirical-analytic context units in any one sampling unit ranged from 83.33% to 97.78%. Hermeneutic context units accounted for as few as 1.11% of the correspondences in any one article to as many as 7.14%. The frequency for context units associated with critical theory ranged from 1.11% to 16.67%. In these sampling units, critical units were identified more often than hermeneutic units in all but two cases: One article yielded equal numbers of hermeneutic and critical units; the other yielded two hermeneutic context units and only one critical unit. Thus, in all samples and all but two sampling units, context units associated

with critical theory were identified approximately two to three times as often as hermeneutic units.

Reliability of the Data

In content analysis reliability may refer to stability, accuracy, or reproducibility (Krippendorff, 1980). In the absence of both test-retest conditions in which stability is generally employed as a measure of reliability and a known standard of comparison in which accuracy becomes a measure of reliability, this design employs reliability as a measure of reproducibility. Reliability of the data is thus concerned with the ability of more than one coder to examine the same recording unit(s) in the same way and is thus primarily a measure of agreement among coders.

Krippendorff (1980) recommends determining the reliability of the data by calculating the agreement coefficient of the data according to the formula employed during the pilot study. This formula yields percentage of co-observances attributable to a pattern of perfect agreement. Unlike Scott's (1955) π or Cohen's (1960) kappa, the agreement coefficient calculated here "corrects for small sample size," is useful with two or more coders, and can be employed

when coders record "nominal scale category assignments" (Krippendorff, 1980, p. 138).

The sample contained four articles in which mismatches among coders appeared. Agreement coefficients for these sampling units were calculated at 0.9390, 0.9394, 0.9410, and 0.9725. This agreement indicates that in the first article, in 93.90% of the cases, observed co-occurrences (i.e., the correspondences agreed upon by the coders) are attributable to perfect agreement rather than to chance. In the second article, then, agreement was 93.94% above chance. In the other two articles, agreement was 94.10% and 97.25% above chance. Employing the standard of lowest reliability measure, agreement of the data was 93.90%.

Reliability of the Sample

The sample consisted of 54 articles describing the field of juvenile correctional education. To assess the adequacy of the sample size, the sample was split in half. Data from both the odd-numbered and the even-numbered sampling units was then analyzed to determine the agreement of each half with the data obtained from all the sampling units.

The absolute and relative frequencies of correspondences between recording and context units in the whole ($S_n = 54$) and each half ($S_n = 27_o$ and $S_n = 27_e$) of the sample are displayed in Table 2. In the odd-numbered half, 85.19% of the sampling units reflected an empirical-analytic orientation. In the even-numbered half, 81.48% of the sampling units contained correspondences only to empirical-analytic context units. Among all coders, empirical-analytic context units were identified most frequently in all sampling units. In all but two articles critical context units were identified more often than hermeneutic units: In one article critical and hermeneutic context units were identified an equal number of times, and in the other sampling unit no critical or hermeneutic units were identified. Thus, both split-halves of the sample yielded the same pattern of recorded data as the sample. Because only one half of the sample must support the conclusions evidenced by the entire sample, the split-half technique thus employed supports the reliability of the sample size.

Table 2

Frequency of Correspondences between Recording Units
and Context Units in the Sample and Split-Half Samples

Sample	<u>Percentage of Context Units Identified</u>			
		Empirical-Analytic	Hermeneutic	Critical
$S_n = 54$				
All Coders (n = 446)	95.52 (n = 426)	1.35 (n = 6)	3.14 (n = 14)	
Coder A (n = 330)	96.97 (n = 320)	0.91 (n = 3)	2.12 (n = 7)	
Coder B (n = 81)	90.12 (n = 3)	3.70 (n = 3)	7.41 (n = 6)	
Coder C (n = 33)	97.06 (n = 33)	-- (n = 0)	2.94 (n = 1)	
$S_n = 27_o$				
All Coders (n = 200)	97.00 (n = 194)	0.50 (n = 1)	2.50 (n = 5)	
Coder A (n = 155)	97.41 (n = 151)	0.65 (n = 1)	1.94 (n = 3)	
Coder B (n = 23)	95.65 (n = 22)	-- (n = 0)	4.35 (n = 1)	
Coder C (n = 22)	95.55 (n = 21)	-- (n = 0)	4.54 (n = 1)	
$S_n = 27_e$				
All Coders (n = 243)	94.24 (n = 229)	2.06 (n = 5)	4.16 (n = 10)	
Coder A (n = 175)	96.00 (n = 168)	1.14 (n = 2)	1.86 (n = 5)	
Coder B (n = 58)	86.21 (n = 50)	5.17 (n = 3)	5.17 (n = 5)	
Coder C (n = 10)	100.00 (n = 10)	-- (n = 0)	-- (n = 0)	

Validity of the Data

In the absence of previous analysis of the theoretical orientation of juvenile correctional education, there are no sources of direct validation for this study. However, the pervasive influence of empirical-analytic theory evidenced in this analysis

is not inconsistent with what is known about the preeminence of this approach to curriculum within the field of education in general. Kliebard (1975b) has identified the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum as the basic framework and perspective in curriculum studies for the past 50 years. Both Huebner (1977) and Ubbelohde (1977, p. 23) describe the empirical-analytic emphasis on a technical cognitive interest as "the prevailing model for curriculum development . . . and the justification of educational purposes or objectives." In short, Tyler's empirical-analytic approach to curriculum remains "the dominant tradition in the field" (Apple, 1982, p. 12) and "the best known and most influential" orientation to curriculum theory.

Much of educational research documents the influence of empirical-analytic theory on instructional practices. White and Tishler (1986) describe the use of behavioral objectives in the teaching of science but note the lack of evidence to support positive student outcomes. The current emphasis on a scientific approach to teaching mathematics also places emphasis on curriculum planning and evaluation on the part of the teacher (Romberg & Carpenter, 1986). And Cazden

(1986) notes that "the most obvious feature of teacher" behavior in at all grade levels "is its preoccupation with matters of control - control of behavior and of talk itself" (p. 443).

Most juvenile correctional educators are trained in traditional teacher training programs emphasizing this orientation to curriculum (Kliebard, 1975b; Mesinger, 1984; Pasternak et al., 1988). Recent demands for increased training of juvenile correctional teachers in special education methods, objectives-based instruction and evaluation, and the use of Individualized Educational Plans to determine both the content and activity of the curricular experience place even more emphasis on the technical scientific bias of empirical-analytic theory (Freasier, 1986; Mesinger, 1987; Platt, Wienke, & Tunick, 1982; Smith, Ramiriz, & Rutherford, 1983). Insofar as the content of their teacher training programs is reflected in the attitudes and activities described by juvenile correctional educators, it is reasonable to identify a high degree of correspondence between empirical-analytic tenets and the ideas expressed in juvenile correctional education literature.

Finally, juvenile correctional educators accomplish their work in institutions that place a premium on control (Gehring, 1980; Mercantino, 1980). Often described as incompatible with the basic aims of education, juvenile correctional institutions often encourage school programs to develop behavior management and student motivation programs consistent with the exercise of authority and behavioral controls in the institution (Gehring, 1989). Moreover, many of these programs are required to rely on the technical and scientific language and procedures associated with special education rules and regulations (Richie & Willis, 1982; Watanabe & Forgone, 1990). Thus, a teacher wishing to provide a curricular experience consistent with the expectations of the larger environment is often forced to rely on instructional approaches consistent with empirical-analytic theory. In their written descriptions of their successes, therefore, methods reflecting a fundamental interest in control receive frequent attention.

In summary, by virtue of its preeminence as the dominant ideology in curriculum studies, empirical-analytic theory appears as the most frequently cited approach to curriculum development, instructional

practices, and evaluation. The fact that this approach constitutes a great deal of what teachers learn about curriculum may influence their choices of what is important to do in the classroom and write about in journal articles. Given the emphasis placed on technical categories and measurable instructional approaches and on behavioral control of students in juvenile correctional institutions, it is reasonable to find curricular experiences designed to control and direct as the subject of much of juvenile correctional education literature.

Chapter V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Each year at least 1.5% of all American children aged 10 to 17 are incarcerated in juvenile correctional facilities (U.S. Bureau of Justice, 1983). Designed to return youthful offenders to society with enhanced potential for academic, social, and vocational success, juvenile corrections has consistently regarded educational programs as an essential element of its rehabilitative efforts. As a result of this emphasis on educational programs in juvenile correctional facilities, many incarcerated youth now spend as much as 40% of their waking hours in juvenile correctional classrooms.

A growing body of research supports the positive impact of appropriate educational interventions in remediating the pattern of academic and social failure characteristic of incarcerated youth. However, many youthful offenders simply do not leave correctional classrooms with the "greater potential for successful adaptation" correctional educators seek to provide

(Mercantino, 1980, p. 19). Recidivism rates remain high, and as the cost of juvenile correctional education have continued to rise in this era of limited fiscal resources, more and more attention has been focused on the apparent shortcomings of current rehabilitative efforts.

Correctional educators have acknowledged that we cannot continue to incarcerate and educate juvenile offenders again and again with little promise of success. They have called for a fundamental reexamination of the field in order to redefine curriculum into an experience more consistent with successful rehabilitation. To date, however, the field of juvenile correctional education remains without a comprehensive examination of the conceptions of knowledge, activity, and values that define the curricular experience. Specifically, juvenile correctional educators have not examined current practices in light of the theoretical constructs that provide the context within which juvenile correctional educational practices can be evaluated.

This study examined current practices in juvenile correctional education in relationship to their curricular context. By examining descriptions of

current attitudes and practices in juvenile correctional education via content analysis of journal articles, this study provides an examination of the relationship between the field's indigenous symbolic forms of communication and the existing conceptions of knowledge, activity, and values that describe its context in curriculum theory.

Conclusions

This study began with one essential research question: Is the field of juvenile correctional education grounded in any particular conception of curriculum theory? Results of the content analysis indicate that the predominant theoretical orientation of the field lies in the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum. In 87.04% of the articles examined, all descriptions of knowledge, activity, and values corresponded to those associated with empirical-analytic curriculum theory. Only 12.96% of the articles examined did not fully reflect this orientation. However, even in these articles at least 85% of the identified conceptions of knowledge, activity, and values in any one sample were associated with the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum.

Despite the preeminent influence of the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum in juvenile correctional literature, some ideas expressed in the sampling units reflected elements of hermeneutic and critical theory. Descriptors of hermeneutic theory accounted for 1.35% of all identified correspondences between recording and context units. Correspondences between ideas expressed in the articles and context units describing critical theory represented 3.14% of all identified correspondences. In any one article, the frequency of hermeneutic context units ranged from 1.11% to 7.14% of the identified correspondences. The frequency for context units associated with critical theory ranged from 1.11% to 16.67%.

References to empirical-analytic theory were present in all articles, while references to hermeneutic theory were identified in only 4 articles and references to critical theory were found in only 7 articles. Thus, while critical context units were identified at least twice as often as hermeneutic units, only 7 of the 54 articles, or 12.96%, held any correspondence to either theoretical orientation.

As expressed in its indigenous and symbolic forms of communication, then, the field of juvenile

correctional education is grounded in the empirical-analytic conception of curriculum. In this approach to curriculum, knowledge is certain, absolute, impersonal, observable, and measurable. Activity is defined, directed, and assessed by the teacher as expert. The values inherent in the experience remain without analysis and without definition apart from the prevailing social environment. This is a conception of curriculum rooted in the dominant interest in control: control of both the content and language of curriculum, control of the activities specifically designed to meet predesignated goals, and control of student outcomes and behaviors.

Discussion

The design of the study imposes certain limitations on the conclusions which can be drawn. As Krippendorff (1980, p. 175) notes, "any analytical procedure by its very nature can be said to imply certain assumptions about the context of the data." In this study, such assumptions may stem from the subjectivity imposed on the data by the coders. Despite the objectivity demanded by the descriptions of the context units and the coding instructions, the

activity of the content analysis involved the reading and interpretation of the sampling units. As Huebner (1977) emphasizes, the interpretation of language is always an essentially subjective activity influenced not only by the coders' experiences but also by the descriptive language itself.

Additional limitations are presented by the method of coding the study. By requiring that 95% of the identified correspondences be associated with a particular orientation to curriculum theory in order for a sampling unit to be considered reflective of that orientation, the study biased the chances for such consideration in favor of sampling units in which larger numbers of correspondences were present. Moreover, because there were only 16 context units associated with empirical-analytic theory, even if all empirical-analytic units were identified and only one correspondence was noted with either a hermeneutic or critical context unit, the sampling unit would not be considered reflective of any one orientation to curriculum theory. Thus, in all sampling units, the identification of only one hermeneutic or critical context unit precluded classification of the sampling unit as reflective of empirical-analytic theory. This

tendency was more pronounced in sampling units with relatively few identified correspondences.

Despite these limitations, the conclusion of the study remains: Juvenile correctional education is oriented toward the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum. In this orientation, certain conceptions of knowledge, activity, and values function to prescribe an approach to curriculum content, to instructional and social interactions, and to the values inherent in the general educational experience. Thus the essential question for juvenile correctional educators becomes: To what extent does the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum prescribe a curricular experience consistent with the aims of juvenile correctional education?

In addressing the extent to which empirical-analytic theory manifests itself in the curricular experiences of students and teachers in juvenile correctional classrooms, the general relationship between theory and practice must be considered. In the materialist understanding of this relationship, educational theory and educational programs are considered as discrete elements. With this understanding it is possible to support the notion

that the implementation of empirical-analytic theory can be accomplished in ways that either minimize or emphasize its basic tenets. When the relationship of theory and practice is defined by the Marxist approach, however, the two are understood as a single activity described by the notion of educational praxis. In this conception, activity based on the tenets of empirical-analytic theory necessarily reflects all aspects of the theoretical approach. Thus, while educators may take steps to minimize the objectification inherent in empirical-analytic curriculum theory, for example, the effects of this element of the theory would still be manifest in the educational program (Small, 1978).

The notion of educational praxis is central to the critical theorists' understanding of the implications of an empirical-analytic approach to the curricular experience (Apple, 1975, 1979, 1982; Macdonald, 1971, 1974, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1977). The following discussion adopts this understanding as a basic assumption. However, it must be noted that further attention to the curricular activities in juvenile correctional classrooms is warranted in order to establish the extent to which the relationship

between the empirical-analytic approach exhibited in descriptions of juvenile correctional education is apparent in the curricular experiences provided in juvenile correctional classrooms.

Juvenile correctional educators agree that juvenile correctional education exists to

make available to the offender . . . the means to develop the knowledge and acquire the skills that will enable him to survive beyond the prison walls. . . . In addition, it is recognized that the system must provide a positive environment and the social and vocational guidance necessary to that the youthful offender can grow in self-confidence, responsibility and self-esteem and develop the emotional maturity essential for success once he is released. (Khatibi, 1988, p. 116)

It is widely recognized, therefore, that a comprehensive juvenile correctional curriculum attends not only to the acquisition of academic and vocational knowledge and skills but also the development of a positive self-image and pro-social skills (Larson, 1988; Roth & Nicholson, 1990; Traynelis-Yurek, 1984; Watanabe & Forgone, 1990). Moreover, correctional educators agree that these elements of an adequate curricular experience cannot be understood as discrete elements. Rather, they are "inextricable woven in a 'chicken and egg' manner" (Mayer & Hoffman, 1982, p. 11).

It is well documented that both academic skills and self-esteem are enhanced when students are active participants in determining the goals, content, instructional activities, and outcomes of any curricular experience. The active participation of students in setting goals has been associated with an increase in the goal directed behavior incompatible with self-defeating, anti-social activity (Freasier, 1986). In the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum, however, the curricular experience is prescribed, directed, and evaluated by the teacher. In its linear-expert model, the student is the passive participant. As Mortimer Adler (1977) notes, this passive, docile position of the student is incompatible with the independence associated with problem-solving skills that allow students to operate successfully in society.

The extent of juvenile correctional education's reliance on teacher-determined goals, content, activity, and assessment can be seen in the advocacy of predetermined instructional programs (Brandhorst & Hodges, 1983; Goldstein, Glick, Reiner, Zimmerman, Coultry, & Gold, 1986; Hamm, 1987; Hartman, 1989; Hodges & Maher, 1981; Khatibi, 1988; Larson, 1988;

Montgomery & Rosamond, 1987; Oliver, 1990; Smetzer, 1989). While these programs may result in statistically significant academic gains on the part of incarcerated youth, they, too, provide little opportunity for the student to be actively engaged in determining the nature of his or her curriculum: "This is the 'banking' concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits" (Freire, 1970, p. 58).

Much of the incarcerated juvenile's curricular experience is described by an Individual Education Plan (IEP) or determined by the use of standardized tests (Besag & Greene, 1981, 1985; Cook & Hill, 1990; Freasier, 1986; Freasier & White, 1983; Grande, 1987; Harper, 1988; Hartman, 1989; Helfeldt & Henk, 1983; Kardash & Rutherford, 1983; Mesinger, 1984, 1987; Platt et al., 1982; Smith et al., 1983). These are essential elements of the empirical-analytic approach to curriculum and its emphasis on the use of behavioral objectives. As Macdonald and Wolfson (1970) have noted, however, "most plans of action that follow from behavioral objectives" cannot allow the active student

participation associated with improved academic and social skills or enhanced self-esteem (p. 124).

Many correctional educators describe the need for a relevant curriculum, one that will provide the student with knowledge and experience to prosper in the society beyond the juvenile correctional institution. As basic tenets of empirical-analytic theory, however, the linear-expert model, the reliance on pre-programmed content and activity, and "the behavioralism which dominates CE" (i.e., correctional education) function to distance the student and his or her unique experiences from the center of the curriculum (Gehring, 1989, p. 166). When "the student by and large does not see the personal need in everyday life for much of what curriculum deals with," he or she is unmotivated to engage in goal directed behaviors (Macdonald, 1975c, pp. 82-83).

Several juvenile correctional educators have described an interest in the consciousness of students as fundamental to the curricular experience that provides opportunities for goal directed behavior and improved self-esteem (Hamm, 1987; Mercantino, 1980; Platt, Clements, Platt, & Alexander, 1988). Yet Macdonald asserts that "facilitation of the

individual's uniqueness and potential is easily refuted" by a standard curriculum monitored by teachers engaged in standardized testing as a means of quality control (1971, p. 237). Instead, these aspects of the empirical-analytic approach encourage the development of an "unreflexive self-understanding" (Young, 1990, p. 74) antithetical to the development of either enhanced self-esteem or "a reflexive comprehension of the traditional, 'natural' operation of the social life process in such a way that self-conscious control could result" (Habermas, 1971, p. 51).

In summary, while the goals of juvenile correctional education remain well defined and generally accepted, the theoretical orientation of the field may offer much to impede the realization of these goals. The technical-scientific bias of juvenile correctional education emphasizes control of the curricular process through the use of programmed instruction, behavioral objectives, and teachers who stand apart from students while determining what and how they should learn. To the extent that the resulting curriculum may be removed from the everyday life of students, it may be incapable of encouraging the reflexive thought and independent action required

of citizens in a democratic society. And, insofar as its compulsion for order may result in a willingness to rely "on an authoritative structure" (Ventre, 1982, p. 19), the goals of the curricular experience may be incompatible with the demands of the society in which juvenile offenders must ultimately function (Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1971; Macdonald 1975c).

Recommendations

Despite the stated need for juvenile correctional educators to "reexamine the programs they have designed . . . (and) the dimensions of their work," little comprehensive analysis has been undertaken (Mesinger, 1987, p. 154). This study examines the field by placing juvenile correctional curriculum in its theoretical curricular context. However, in concluding that the field of juvenile correctional education is rooted in an empirical-analytic orientation to curriculum, this analysis serves as only a small part of the required fundamental reexamination.

Further content analysis would serve to validate this study. This study focused attention on a sample of the literature of juvenile correctional education as the source of data. There are, however, many other

indigenous forms of communication in the field worthy of examination: Interviews with juvenile correctional educators, classroom dialogue, and instructional materials provide rich sources of data concerning the relative influence of empirical-analytic theory in correctional classrooms. Analysis of the language of correctional education, whether in journal articles, instructional materials, or classroom dialogue, would be beneficial in validating the dominance of control interests.

To the extent that further study may serve to validate, or refute, the empirical-analytic orientation of curriculum theory, several design modifications may be warranted. Because of the difficulties encountered in establishing standards for inclusion of sampling units in a category of curriculum theory, a greater number of content units would be beneficial. This could be accomplished by making the units "smaller" so that, for example, "employs behavioral objectives" would be divided to become "employs behavioral objectives," "refers to IEP's," "employs performance evaluation," etc.

Dreikurs and Grey (1968) and Dreikurs et al. (1971) have noted that inappropriate and delinquent

behaviors have the same etiology: We "misbehave" when our goals are incompatible with the demands of the environment or when we fail to adequately perceive how to achieve our pro-social goals. This study accepted the stated goals of juvenile correctional education as given and concluded that juvenile correctional educators may have misperceived how to accomplish those goals. Further studies might examine more closely the relationship between an empirical-analytic theoretical approach to juvenile correctional education and classroom practices to establish the exact relationship between theory and practice in juvenile correctional classrooms in relationship to these goals. Additional studies might examine the feasibility and desirability of the goals of juvenile correctional education themselves in terms of both the requirements of society and the needs of the students it serves.

Appropriate education can reduce recidivism and contribute to the successful rehabilitation of juvenile offenders (Ventre, 1982). The fact that the national rate of recidivism for juveniles remains high has suggested a need for change in programs provided to incarcerated youth. As a part of the services made available to juvenile offenders, educational programs

require close examination both as discrete elements of rehabilitation and in relationship to other components of juvenile corrections. Whether correctional educators pursue the reexamination of their field by engaging in the above suggested studies or follow other avenues of research, however, the importance and urgency of the task cannot be overstated: For the 500,000 children and adolescents who will be incarcerated this year, as well as for the taxpayers who support them, the present approach is simply not good enough.

REFERENCES

- Adler, M. (1977). Reforming education. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Angle, T. (1982). The development of educational programs in American adult prisons and juvenile reformatories during the Nineteenth Century. Journal of Correctional Education, 33(3), 4-7.
- Apple, M. (1975). Commonsense categories and curriculum thought. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (Eds.), Schools in search of meaning (pp. 116-148). Washington, DC: ASCD.
- Apple, M. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. (1982). Education and power. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bateman, D. R. (1974). The politics of curriculum. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory: The proceedings of the Rochester conference (pp. 55-68). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Besag, F. P., & Greene, J. B. (1981). Once is too much, I: Educational testing in a correctional facility. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(1), 4-8.
- Besag, F., & Greene, J. (1985). Recipe for research: Intelligent Blacks plus inappropriate tests = genetic inferiority. The Journal of Correctional Education, 36(3), 110-115.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). The curriculum. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. White Plains, NY: Longman.

- Bowers, C. A. (1982). The reproduction of technological consciousness: Locating the ideological foundations of a radical pedagogy. Teachers College Record, 83, 529-557.
- Brandhorst, A., & Hodges, B. (1983). Pilot study on the instructional efficiency of the Lowell Thomas Remembers Tapes. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(1), 30-33.
- Broder, P. K., Dunivant, N., Smith, E. C., & Sutton, L. P. (1981). Further observations on the link between learning disabilities and juvenile delinquency. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 838-850.
- Budd, R. W., & Thorp, R. K. (1963). An introduction to content analysis. Iowa City: University of Iowa School of Journalism.
- Carney, T. F. (1972). Content analysis: A technique for systematic inference from Communication. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Cazden, C. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 432-463). New York: Macmillan.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20(1), 37-46.
- Cole, P., Chan, L., & Lytton, L. (1989). Perceived competence of juvenile delinquents and nondelinquents. The Journal of Special Education, 23, 294-302.
- Coleman, E. B. (1962). Improving comprehensibility by shortening sentences. Journal of Applied Psychology, 44, 131-134.

- Cook, J. M., & Hill, G. P. (1990). Preplacement characteristics and educational status of handicapped and non-handicapped youthful offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(4), 194-198.
- DeCharms, R., & Moeller, G. H. (1962). Values expressed in American children's readers: 1800-1950. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 64, 136-142.
- Dewey, J. (1966). Experience and education. New York: Collier.
- Dreikurs, R., & Grey, L. (1968). Logical consequences: A handbook of discipline. New York: Meredith Press.
- Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B., & Pepper, F. (1971). Maintaining sanity in the classroom: Illustrated teaching techniques. New York: Harper & Row.
- Eisner, E. (1979). The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan.
- Elliott, D. S., (1980). A repertoire of impact measures. In M. W. Klein & K. S. Teilmann (Eds.), Handbook of criminal justice evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Fox, D. (1969). The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Freasier, A. (1986). Involving juvenile offenders in the IEP planning process. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(4), 134-139.
- Freasier, A., & White, T. (1983). IEP communicators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(1), 27-29.
- Freedman, B. J., Rosenthal, R., Donahoe, C. P., Schlundy, D. G., & McFall, R. M. (1978). A social behavior analysis of skill deficits in delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent boys. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1448-1462.
- Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Seabury.

- Freire, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness. New York: Continuum.
- Gehring, T. (1980). Correctional education and the United States Department of Education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 31(3), 4-6.
- Gehring, T. (1988). Five principles of correctional education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(4), 164-168.
- Gehring, T. (1989). A change in our way of thinking. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(4), 166-173.
- Geller, A., Kaplan, D., & Lasswell, H. D. (1942). An experimental comparison of four ways of coding editorial comment. Journalism Quarterly, 19, 362-370.
- Gerbner, G., Holsti, O. R., Krippendorff, K., Paisley, W. J., & Stone, P. J. (1969). The analysis of communication content. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goldstein, A., Glick, B., Reiner, S., Zimmerman, D., Coultry, T., & Gold, D. (1986). Aggression replacement training: A comprehensive intervention for the acting-out delinquent. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(3), 120-126.
- Grande, C. G. (1987). GED predictions: An administrative tool for planning correctional education for male youthful offenders. Journal of Correctional Education, 38(3), 124-127.
- Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (1985). Statistics for the behavioral sciences. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.
- Greene, M. (1974). Cognition, consciousness, and curriculum. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory: The proceedings of the Rochester conference (pp. 69-84). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

- Grisson, G. R. (1988). Glen Mills schools research project: Summary report. Philadelphia, PA: University City Science Center.
- Gutek, J. L. (1988). Philosophical and ideological perspectives on education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Haberman, M., & Quinn, L. (1986). The high school re-entry myth: A followup study of juveniles released from two correctional high schools in Wisconsin. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(3), 114-117.
- Habermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and human interests. (J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1968)
- Hamm, M. (1987). The human potential seminar: A strategy for teaching socially adaptive behavior in a correctional classroom. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(1), 4-7.
- Harper, G. (1986). Mental ability and academic achievement of male juvenile offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(1), 17-22.
- Hartman, H. J. (1989). Computer adaptive testing: A technological advance in educational measurement ideally suited for correctional education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(3), 138-141.
- Hazel, J. S., Schumaker, J. B., Sherman, J. A., & Sheldon, J. (1982). Application of a group training program in social skills and problem solving to learning disabled and non-learning disabled youth. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 5, 398-408.
- Helfeldt, J., & Henk, W. (1983). Administering a group reading inventory: An initiative in improving reading instruction. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(3), 76-79.
- Herman, J. (1989, October). Site-based management: Creating a vision and mission statement. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, pp. 79-83.

- Hodges, B., & Maher, D. (1981). Competency based education: Implications for education in juvenile correctional settings. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(3), 14-16.
- Holder, S. (1988). A dialectical approach to moral issues in the prison English classroom. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(2), 86-89.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Huebner, D. (1975). Curricular language and classroom meanings. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp. 217-236). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Huebner, D. (1977). Toward a political economy of curriculum and human development. In A. Molnar & J. A. Zahorik (Eds.), Curriculum theory (pp. 92-107). Washington, DC: ASCD.
- Janis, I. L. (1965). The problem of validating content analysis. In H. D. Laswell, N. Leites, & associates (Eds.), Language of politics: Studies in quantitative semantics (pp. 55-82). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jardine, D. W. (1988). Play and hermeneutics: An exploration of the bi-polarities of mutual understanding. The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 8, 23-41.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1975). Increase in self-rejection as an antecedent of deviant responses. The Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 281-282.
- Kardash, C., & Rutherford, R. (1983). Meeting special education needs of adolescents in the Arizona Department of Corrections. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(3), 97-98.
- Khatibi, M. (1988). A curriculum for life skills training programs in a correctional setting. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(3), 114-120.

- Kingsley, C. (1918). Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, appointed by the National Education Association. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1975a). Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp. 51-69). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1975b). Persistent curriculum issues in historical perspective. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp. 39-50). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1975c). Reappraisal: The Tyler rationale. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp. 70-83). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Kobre, S. (1953). How Florida dailies handled the 1952 presidential campaign. Journalism Quarterly, 30, 163-169.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Krippendorff, K. (1986). Information theory: Structural models for qualitative data. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Larson, K. (1988). Remediating problem solving skills. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(2), 70-74.
- Laufenberg, R. (1987). Positive peer culture: A peer group approach to behavior change. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(4), 138-143.
- Lewis, K., Schwartz, G., & Ianacone, R. (1988). Service coordination between correctional and public school systems for handicapped juvenile offenders. Exceptional Children, 55, 66-77.
- Macdonald, J. (1971). The school as double agent. Washington, DC: ASCD.

- Macdonald, J. (1974). Transcendental developmental education. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory: The proceedings of the Rochester conference (pp. 85-116). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Macdonald, J. (1975a). Curriculum and human interest. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp. 283-298). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Macdonald, J. (1975b). Curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp. 5-13). Washington, DC: ASCD.
- Macdonald, J. (1975c). The quality of everyday life in school. In J. Macdonald & E. Zaret (Eds.), Schools in search of meaning (pp. 116-148). Washington, DC: ASCD.
- Macdonald, J. (1977). Values bases and issues for curriculum. In A. Molnar & J.A. Zahorik (Eds.), Curriculum theory (pp. 10-21). Washington, DC: ASCD.
- Macdonald, J., & Wolfson, B. J. (1970, December). A case against behavioral objectives. The Elementary School Journal, 119-128.
- Mann, J. S. (1975). A discipline of curriculum theory. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory: The proceedings of the Rochester conference (pp. 149-164). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- McCarthy, T. (1978). The critical theory of Jurgen Habermas. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marx, K. (1972). Part I: Feurbach. In C. J. Arthur (Ed.), The German ideology (pp. 39-95). New York: International.
- Maslow, A. H. (1971). The farther reaches of human nature. New York: Viking.

- Mayer, E., & Hoffman, R. (1982). A comparison of the effects of individualized instruction with group instruction on the academic achievement and self-concept of youthful offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 33(4), 11-12.
- Mercantino, A. (1980). A volunteer tutoring program in correctional education: A unique and successful approach in utilizing volunteers in a learning laboratory program. The Journal of Correctional Education, 31(3), 19-20.
- Mesinger, J. (1977). Juvenile delinquents: A relatively untapped population for special special education professionals. Behavioral Disorders, 2(2), 95-101.
- Mesinger, J. (1984). Some thoughts on integrating special education with correctional education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 35(3), 77-79.
- Mesinger, J. (1987). Educateur training as a resource model for special/correctional educators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(4), 154-158.
- Montgomery, D., & Rosamond, S. (1987). SEED curriculum (social, emotional, educational development). The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(1), 12-16.
- Morgan, D. (1979). Prevalence and types of handicapping conditions found in juvenile correctional institutions: A national survey. Journal of Special Education, 13, 283-295.
- Murphy, D. M. (1986). The prevalence of handicapping conditions among juvenile delinquents. Remedial and Special Education, 3(2), 7-13.
- Nelson, C. M., Rutherford, R. B., & Wolford, B. I. (1987). Special education in the criminal justice system. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Oliver, J. (1990). Exemplary computer-assisted instructional programs: Al Maresh Memorial Award finalists. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(2), 96-102.

- Osgood, C. E. (1959). The representation model and relevant research methods. In I. de Sola Pool (Ed.), Trends in content analysis (pp. 33-88). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Pasternak, R., Portillos, R., & Hoff, H. (1988). Providing an appropriate education to adjudicated and incarcerated juvenile delinquents: The challenge to correctional education administrators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(4), 154-159.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. G., Jones, R. R., & Conger, R. E. (1975). A social learning approach to family intervention (Vol. 1). Eugene, OR: Catalise.
- Perryman, P. (1988). Predicting recidivism of handicapped and nonhandicapped juvenile offenders. Unpublished manuscript.
- Pinar, W. (Ed.) (1974). Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory: The proceedings of the Rochester conference. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. (1975a). Currere: Toward reconceptualization. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory: The proceedings of the Rochester conference (pp. 396-414). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. (Ed.) (1975b). Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Platt, J., Clements, J. E., Platt, J., & Alexander, R. (1988). Self-charting as a technique to increase independence in pre-delinquent and delinquent youth. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(1), 12-16.
- Platt, J., Wienke, W., & Tunick, R. (1982). The need for training in special education for correction educators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(4), 8-12.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). The tacit dimension. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

- Prout, H. T. (1981). The incidence of suspected exceptional education needs among youth in juvenile facilities. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(4), 22-24.
- Raths, J. (1969). Worthwhile activities. College Park: University of Maryland, Bureau of Educational Research. (No page numbers)
- Richey, D. D., & Miller, M. (1987). Academically-related behavior among delinquent boys: Their self-ratings and those of teachers. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(1), 26-28.
- Richey, D. D., & Willis, T. (1982). Improving education for handicapped, incarcerated youth: Priority setting and problem identification by front-line staff during inservice training. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(4), 27-30.
- Roberts, L. (1989). Inmate education in Florida's 19th Century penal system: A failure of good intentions. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(4), 148-150.
- Robins, L. N. (1966). Deviant children grown up. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.
- Romberg, T., & Carpenter, T. (1986). Research on teaching and learning mathematics; Two disciplines of scientific inquiry. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 850-873). New York: Macmillan.
- Romig, D. A. (1978). Justice for our children. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Rosander, G. A. (1987). In San Diego County, court schools educate teens when no one else can. The American School Board Journal, 174(2), 29-30.
- Roth, H., & Nicholson, C. (1990). Differences in learning styles between unsuccessfully mainstreamed violent and assaultive youth. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(3), 134-137.

- Rutherford, R. D., Nelson, C. M., & Wolford, B. I. (1985). Special education in the most restrictive environment: Correctional/special education. Journal of Special Education, 19, 59-71.
- Ryan, T. A. (1983). Prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 5, 5-12.
- Schubert, W., Schubert, A., Herzog, L., Posner, G., & Kridel, C. (1988). A genealogy of curriculum researchers. The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 8(1), 137-147.
- Scott, W. A. (1955). Reliability of content analysis: The case of nominal scale coding. Public Opinion Quarterly, 19, 321-325.
- Sindelar, K. A. (1982). Willie M: Treatment for troubled children. School Law Bulletin, 13(1), 5-9.
- Small, R. (1978). Educational praxis. Educational Theory, 28, 214-222.
- Smetzer, J. (1989). Physics with a new approach. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(4), 181-184.
- Smith, D. (1983). Certification vs. education in correctional schools: A major problem and its solution. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(3), 99-100.
- Smith, B., Ramiriz, B., & Rutherford, R. (1983). Special education in youth correctional facilities. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(4), 108-112.
- Snarr, R. W., & Wolford, B. I. (1985). Introduction to corrections. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Starratt, R. J. (1974). Curriculum theory: Controversy, challenge, and future concerns. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution and curriculum theory: The proceedings of the Rochester conference (pp. 16-35). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

- Stone, P. J., Dunphy, D. C., Smith, M. S., & Ogilvie, D. M. (1966). The general inquirer: A computer approach to content analysis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sutton, J. P., & Whittier, K. S. (1989). Transition programs in juvenile corrections: Results of a nationwide survey. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(4), 162-165.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper.
- Traynelis-Yurek, E. (1984). The feasibility of upgrading reading skills through an oral reading program. The Journal of Correctional Education, 35(1), 31-33.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- U.S. Department of Justice (1983). Report to the nation on crime and justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice (1984). Juvenile court statistics 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice (1988). Court careers of juvenile offenders. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ubbelohde, R. (1977). A neo-conservative approach to curriculum. In A. Molnar & J. A. Zahorik (Eds.), Curriculum theory (pp. 22-34). Washington, DC: ASCD.
- Ventre, R. (1982). Cognitive moral development in the prison classroom. The Journal of Correctional Education, 33(3), 18-26.
- Wallerstein, N. (1988). Interdisciplinary approaches to Paulo Freire's educational theory. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 8(1), 53-67.

- Watanabe, A., & Forgone, C. (1990). The mentally handicapped juvenile offender: A call for transition. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(1), 20-24.
- Willis, G. (1975). Curriculum theory and the context of curriculum. In W. Pinar (Ed.), Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists (pp.427-444). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- White, R., & Tisher, R. (1986). Research on natural science. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 874-905). New York: Macmillan.
- Young, R. (1990). A critical theory of education: Habermas and our children's future. New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix A

SAMPLING UNITS

- Arbuthnot, J., & Gordon, D. (1983). Moral reasoning development in correctional intervention. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(4), 133-138.
- Arbuthnot, J., & Gordon, D. (1988). Disseminating effective interventions for juvenile delinquents: Cognitively-based sociomoral reasoning development programs. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(2), 48-53.
- Bauer, G. (1986). Why it's a crime to promote value-free education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(2), 42-43.
- Bell, T. (1981). "Remarks" - Education: A weapon against crime. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(1), 4.
- Besag, F., & Greene, J. (1981). Once is too much, II: Exceptional education definitions. The Journal of Correctional Education, 36(3), 17-20.
- Besag, F., & Greene, J. (1985). Recipe for research: Intelligent Blacks plus inappropriate tests = genetic inferiority. The Journal of Correctional Education, 36(3), 110-115.
- Brandhorst, A., & Hodges, B. (1983). Pilot study on the instructional efficiency of the Lowell Thomas Remembers Tapes. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(1), 30-33.
- Coffey, O. (1981). The educator as advocate. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(3), 4-8.
- Cook, J. M., & Hill, G. P. (1990). Preplacement characteristics and educational status of handicapped and non-handicapped youthful offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(4), 194-198.

- Farmer, J. (1990). Juvenile exploitation of juvenile correctional workers: A content analysis. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(3), 118-119.
- Fejes-Mendoza, K., & Rutherford, R. (1987). Learning handicapped and nonlearning handicapped female juvenile offenders: Educational and criminal profiles. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(4), 148-153.
- Freasier, A. (1986). Involving juvenile offenders in the IEP planning process. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(4), 134-139.
- Freasier, A., & White, T. (1983). IEP communicators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(1), 27-29.
- Garfunkel, F. (1986). The conditions of correctional education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(4), 157-160.
- Goldstein, A., Glick, B., Reiner, S., Zimmerman, D., Coultry, T., & Gold, D. (1986). Aggression replacement training: A comprehensive intervention for the acting-out delinquent. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(3), 120-126.
- Grande, C. (1987). GED predictions: An administrative tool for planning correctional education for male youthful offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(3), 124-128.
- Haberman, M., & Quinn, L. (1986). The high school re-entry myth: A follow-up study of juveniles released from two correctional high schools in Wisconsin. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(3), 114-117.
- Hamm, M. (1987). The human potential seminar: A strategy for teaching socially adaptive behavior in a correctional classroom. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(1), 4-7.
- Harper, G. (1988). Mental ability and academic achievement of male juvenile offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(1), 17-22.

- Hartman, H. J. (1989). Computer adaptive testing: A technological advance in educational measurement ideally suited for correctional education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(3), 138-141.
- Helfeldt, J., & Henk, W. (1983). Administering a group reading inventory: An initiative in improving reading instruction. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(3), 76-79.
- Hodges, B., & Maher, D. (1981). Competency based education: Implications for education in juvenile correctional settings. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(3), 14-16.
- Just, D. (1985). The relationship between delinquent behavior and work values of non-institutionalized youth. The Journal of Correctional Education, 36(4), 148-154.
- Kane, B., & Bragg, R. (1984). School behavior study. The Journal of Correctional Education, 35(4), 118-122.
- Kardash, C., & Rutherford, R. (1983). Meeting special education needs of adolescents in the Arizona Department of Corrections. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(3), 97-98.
- Khatibi, M. (1988). A curriculum for life skills training programs in a correctional setting. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(3), 114-120.
- Larson, K. (1988). Remediating problem solving skills. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(2), 70-74.
- Laufenberg, R. (1987). Positive peer culture: A peer group approach to behavior change. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(4), 138-143.
- Maddox, M., Webb, S., Allen, L., Faust, T., Abrams, D., & Lynch, A. (1984). Transitioning adjudicated youth back to community schools. The Journal of Correctional Education, 35(4), 124-128.

- Mayer, E., & Hoffman, R. (1982). A comparison of the effects of individualized instruction with group instruction on the academic achievement and self-concept of youthful offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 33(4), 11-12.
- Mercantino, A. (1980). A volunteer tutoring program in correctional education: A unique and successful approach in utilizing volunteers in a learning laboratory program. The Journal of Correctional Education, 31(3), 19-33.
- Mesinger, J. (1984). Some thoughts on integrating special education with correctional education. The Journal of Correctional Education, 35(3), 77-79.
- Mesinger, J. (1987). Educateur training as a resource model for special/correctional educators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(4), 154-158.
- Miller, D., & Carrington, R. (1989). Teaching women's literature to adolescent female offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(1), 5-9.
- Montgomery, D., & Rosamond, S. (1987). SEED curriculum (social, emotional, educational development). The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(1), 12-16.
- Opalack, N. (1988). Dispelling the myth: Juvenile offenders do return to educational/vocational programs post-incarceration. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(3), 126-128.
- Pasternak, R., Portillos, R., & Hoff, H. (1988). Providing an appropriate education to adjudicated and incarcerated juvenile delinquents: The challenge to correctional education administrators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(4), 154-159.
- Platt, J., Clements, J. E., Platt, J., & Alexander, R. (1988). Self-charting as a technique to increase independence in pre-delinquent and delinquent youth. The Journal of Correctional Education, 39(1), 12-16.

- Platt, J., Wienke, W., & Tunich, R. (1982). The need for training in special education for correction educators. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(4), 8-12.
- Ramsey, C. (1986). Mending muddled minds. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(1), 4-7.
- Reynolds, J. (1982). Incarcerated students: Change and conflict. The Journal of Correctional Education, 33(3), 15-18.
- Richey, D., & Miller, M. (1987). Academically-related behavior among delinquent boys: Their self-ratings and those of teachers. The Journal of Correctional Education, 38(1), 26-28.
- Richey, D., & Willis, T. (1982). Improving education for handicapped, incarcerated youth: Priority setting and problem identification by front-line staff during inservice training. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(4), 27-30.
- Rincker, J., Reilly, T., & Braaten, S. (1990). Academic and intellectual characteristics of adolescent juvenile offenders. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(3), 124-131.
- Roth, H., & Nicholson, C. (1990). Differences in learning styles between unsuccessfully mainstreamed violent and assaultive youth. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(3), 134-137.
- Smetzer, J. (1989). Physics with a new approach. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(4), 181-184.
- Smith, B., Ramiriz, B., & Rutherford, R. (1983). Special education in youth correctional facilities. The Journal of Correctional Education, 34(4), 108-112.
- Sutherland, D., & Schwartz-DuPree, G. (1986). Federally-supported correctional/special education personnel training programs. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(4), 162-164.

- Sutton, J., & Whittier, K. (1989). Transition programs in juvenile corrections: Results of a nationwide survey. The Journal of Correctional Education, 40(4), 162-165.
- Swanstrom, W., Randle, C., & Offord, K. (1981). The frequency of learning disability: A comparison between juvenile delinquent and seventh grade populations. The Journal of Correctional Education, 32(3), 29-33.
- Traynelis-Yurek, E. (1984). The feasibility of upgrading reading skills through an oral reading program. The Journal of Correctional Education, 35(1), 31-33.
- Van Nagel, C., Foley, L., Dixon, M., & Kauffman, J. (1986). A review of treatment methods for the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. The Journal of Correctional Education, 37(4), 140-145.
- Watanabe, A., & Forgone, C. (1990). The mentally handicapped juvenile offender: A call for transition. The Journal of Correctional Education, 41(1), 20-24.
- Williams, J., Wheeler, K., Mance, B., & Freasier, A. (1984). 3 M's = G.E.D....motivation...management...momentum. The Journal of Correctional Education, 35(3), 97-103.

Appendix B
RECORDING FORM

TITLE _____

AUTHOR _____ DATE _____ CODER _____
=====

Knowledge/activities are sequenced

Decisions about what knowledge should
be/has been acquired are based on
observation/measurement (pre/posttest,
standardized testing, curriculum-based
assessment)

Behavioral change(s) indicates that
knowledge has been acquired/learning
has occurred

Knowledge is categorized according to
subjects or academic disciplines

Knowledge is acquired by the understanding
of meaning (may refer to textual
interpretation, the meaning of the
experience)

Curricular content is based on problems
drawn from real social conditions

The student is encouraged to pose problems
and solutions drawn from his/her own
experience(s)

Curricular content/desired outcomes are stated in terms of objectives reflecting desirable social behaviors consistent with the needs or norms of society

Includes an analysis of the values influencing the selection of curricular content and activities

Places curricular issues in the context of history, politics, and/or culture

The teacher is the expert

The teacher determines what the student must learn or what skill(s) the student must acquire

The teacher prescribes the activities the student(s) engages in

The teacher evaluates to what extent the student has learned

Assumes a connection between teacher behavior and student learning

Employs dialogue among teachers and community members to determine curricular content

Teacher-student communication is based on reciprocal communication

What is learned and how learning takes place is determined as a result of a dialogue in which the student is an active participant

Teachers, students, community members are co-learners

Students progress through similar content activities

Activities are directed toward the study of social problems and their resolution

Employs group process model for building consensus

Activities encourage students to uncover/define problems and pose own solutions

All aspects of curriculum are based on the needs and experiences of the participants

Measures success of curricular experiences in terms of improved rate of learning or doing and/or an increase in the amount known or accomplished (i.e., efficiency of instruction)

Employs behavioral objectives (including references to Individual Educational Plans [IEPs]), objective-based assessment, performance evaluation, competency-based instruction, outcomes-based assessment, curriculum-based assessment

Evaluates only behaviors cited in objectives

The goal of the curricular experience is consensus or the resolution of conflict (mutual understanding)

The goal of the curricular experience is to uncover one's place in society and to effect change

Provides prescription for classroom use

Employs a technical vocabulary (i.e., training, efficiency, task/job analysis, analysis, effectiveness, management) to describe curricular content or activity including "scientific" categories in describing students (e.g., learning disabled, attention-deficit disorder)

Describes an interest in the consciousness of the participants (may refer to self-realization, empowerment, or individual potential)

Appendix C

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

1. Read Chapters I, II, and III. These are included in your packet of articles and coding forms.
2. If you have any questions, particularly about the categories of curriculum theory delineated in Chapter III, please contact the author for clarification before you begin your coding.
3. Write the title of the article, the date you record your data, and your initials on the top of the recording form.
4. Use one recording form for each article.
5. Read the article through once. Do not begin coding until the article has been read.
6. Look at the recording form. There are three columns on the form. In the middle column, you will see descriptive phrases. As you read the article, if you find a sentence, a complete thought, or an idea that relates to one of the descriptive phrases, place a check mark in the left-hand column next to the appropriate descriptor. The column to the right of the phrase(s) is reserved for your comments.
7. Sentences, phrases, words, ideas, or thoughts expressed in the articles relate to the descriptive phrases on the recording form insofar as they address the same general concerns.
8. If you are unsure if an article refers to one of the descriptors on the recording form, do not place a check mark on the recording form. Note your question as a comment in the column to the right. Use this comments section to note anything you are unsure of or anything you think might be relevant in the data analysis. Where you have specific concerns, please indicate paragraph/sentence references, page numbers, etc.

9. If it is clear to you that an article refers to one of the descriptors but you are unable to match specific vocabulary, place a check mark in the appropriate row and column anyway. You do not have to match vocabulary and/or phrases exactly.
10. If an article is critical of the position expressed by one of the descriptors on the coding form, DO NOT place a check mark in that space. Do note the criticism in the comments column.

Appendix D
RECORDING FORM-R

TITLE _____

AUTHOR _____ DATE _____ CODER _____
=====

Empirical-Analytic Theory

Provides prescriptions for classroom use

Decisions about what knowledge should be/
has been acquired are based on observation/
measurement (pre/post-test, standardized
testing, curriculum-based assessment)

Behavioral change(s) indicates that
learning has occurred

Knowledge/activities are sequenced

Measures success of curricular
experiences in terms of improved rate of
learning or doing/increase in amount
known or accomplished (i.e., efficiency
of instruction)

Students progress through similar
content/activities

Employs behavioral objectives (including references to Individual Educational Plans [IEP's], objectives-based assessment, performance evaluation, competency-based instruction, outcomes-based assessment, curriculum-based assessment

Evaluates only behaviors cited in objectives

Curricular content/desired outcomes are stated in terms of objectives reflecting desirable social behaviors consistent with the needs or norms of society

The teacher is the expert

The teacher determines what the student must learn or what skill(s) the student must acquire

The teacher prescribes the activities the student(s) engages in

The teacher evaluates to what extent the student has learned

Assumes a connection between teacher behavior and student learning

Employs technical vocabulary (e.g., training, efficiency, task/job analysis, effectiveness, management) to describe curricular content or activity including "scientific" categories in describing students)e.g., learning disabled, attention-deficit disordered

Knowledge is categorized according
to subjects or disciplines

Hermeneutic Theory

Knowledge is acquired by the understanding
of meaning (may refer to textual inter-
pretation, the meaning of the experience)

The goal of the curricular experience is
consensus or the resolution of conflict
(mutual understanding)

Employs group process model for
building consensus

Employs dialogue among teachers and
community members to determine
curricular content

Teacher-student communication is based
on reciprocal communication

Activities are directed toward the study
of social problems and their resolution

Curricular content is based on problems
drawn from real social conditions

Critical Theory

Describes an interest in the consciousness
of the participants (may refer to self-
realization, empowerment, or individual
potential)

Activities encourage student to uncover/
define problems and to pose his/her own
solutions

All aspects of the experience are based
on the needs and experiences of the
participants

The student is encouraged to pose
problems and solutions drawn from
his/her own experience(s)

Includes an analysis of the values
influencing the selection of content
and activity

Places curricular issues in the context
of history, politics, and/or culture

What is learned and how learning takes
place is determined as a result of a
dialogue in which the student is an
active participant

Teachers, students, community members
are co-learners

The goal of curricular experience is to
uncover one's place in society and to
effect change

Appendix E

Table A

Frequency of Identification of Context Units

Context Unit	Number of Correspondences With Recording Units
Empirical-Analytic Theory	
Provides prescriptions for classroom use	23
Decisions about what knowledge should be/has been acquired are based on observation/measurement (pre/post-test, standardized testing, curriculum-based assessment)	47
Behavioral change(s) indicates that learning has occurred	16
Knowledge/activities are sequenced	18
Measures success of curricular experiences in terms of improved rate of learning or doing/increase in amount known or accomplished (i.e., efficiency of instruction)	18
Students progress through similar content/activities	22

Table A (continued)

Context Unit	Number of Correspondences With Recording Units
Employs behavioral objectives (including references to Individual Educational Plans [IEP's]), objectives- based assessment, performance evaluation, competency-based instruction, outcomes-based assessment, curriculum-based assessment	31
Evaluates only behaviors cited in objectives	15
Curricular content/desired outcomes are stated in terms of objectives reflecting desirable social behaviors consistent with the needs or norms of society	21
The teacher is the expert	27
The teacher determines what the student must learn or what skill(s) the student must acquire	33
The teacher prescribes the activities the student(s) engages in	24
The teacher evaluates to what extent the student has learned	20
Assumes a connection between teacher behavior and student learning	27

Table A (continued)

Context Unit	Number of Correspondences With Recording Units
Employs technical vocabulary (e.g., training, efficiency, task/job analysis, effectiveness, management) to describe curricular content or activity including "scientific" categories in describing students) e.g., learning disabled, attention-deficit disordered	52
Knowledge is categorized according to subjector disciplines	32
Hermeneutic Theory	
Knowledge is acquired by the understanding of meaning (may refer to textual interpretation, the meaning of the experience)	0
The goal of the curricular experience is consensus or the resolution of conflict (mutual understanding)	0
Employs group process model for building consensus	0
Employs dialogue among teachers and community members to determine curricular content	1

Table A (continued)

Context Unit	Number of Correspondences With Recording Units
Teacher-student communication is based on reciprocal communication	5
Activities are directed toward the study of social problems and their resolution	0
Curricular content is based on problems drawn from real social conditions	0
Critical Theory	
Describes an interest in the consciousness of the participants (may refer to self-realization, empowerment, or individual potential)	8
Activities encourage student to uncover/define problems and to pose his/her own solutions	2
All aspects of the experience are based on the needs and experiences of the participants	0
The student is encouraged to pose problems and solutions drawn from his/her own experience(s)	0

Table A (continued)

Context Unit	Number of Correspondences With Recording Units
Includes an analysis of the values influencing the selection of content and activity	1
Places curricular issues in the context of history, politics, and/or culture	0
What is learned and how learning takes place is determined as a result of a dialogue in which the student is an active participant	2
Teachers, students, community members are co-learners	1
The goal of curricular experience is to uncover one's place in society and to effect change	0